Volume III Number 3

# THE CROZER QUARTERLY

JULY, 1926

ISSUED BY THE

Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary

EDWARD B. POLLARD, *Managing Editor*
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, *Business Manager*

## CONTENTS

PAGE

THE BAPTISTS AND CHURCH UNION. Douglas Clyde Macintosh ..... 259

ART AND DRAMATISM IN WORSHIP. Eugene Edmond Ayres ..... 279

READJUSTMENTS OF THE MODERN MINISTER. Frank L. Anderson ..... 294

AN ORTHODOX HERETIC OF THE FOURTH CENTURY. Albert H. Newman ..... 307

EVOLVING CHRISTIAN IDEAS AND THE PROBLEM OF TERMS. Ralph W. Nelson ..... 325

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES

Editorial Notes ..... 337

Travel Notes of an Excavator. Edward Chiera ..... 339

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

Nestorius: The Bazaar of Heraclides. A. H. Newman ..... 351

The Greatest Preacher in the United States. Thomas H. Sprague ..... 353

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE ..... 357

BOOK REVIEWS ..... 359

*Printed for* CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY *By*

THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA

*Price, 40 cents. Annual Subscription, $1.50, post free*

consistency on the part of their pedobaptist and non-immersionist fellow-Christians, who have also claimed to follow the New Testament rule of faith and practise, still the effect upon the Baptist spirit has been none the less unfortunate. Being compelled, for the sake of consistency, to act narrowly, they have been led to think and feel narrowly. Too often they have been satisfied to think of themselves as obedient because they have been baptized in accordance with the New Testament rule, and of other good Christians as correspondingly disobedient on the mere ground of their not having been so baptized. Moreover, in so far as close communion has been practised, from however worthy motives, this refusal to symbolize outwardly the communion which undeniably exists between all true Christians as they live in fellowship with their common Lord has inevitably had an unfortunate tendency to foster an exclusive, unsociable, and to that extent unchristian type of religious life.

There are many Baptists today who are in revolt against the denominationalism which would force them into this unspiritual, unsocial, and unchristian position. They feel, and rightly, that what Baptists have really been interested in has been spiritual, evangelical Christianity, not the comparatively insignificant matters of distinctive denominational belief and practise. The situation is much more acute among American Baptists than among those of England, who have not only for generations followed the practise of open communion, but also the practise of occasionally receiving members into the church before immersion, or even without baptism in any form. It is to be noted, however, that among American Baptists of the Northern Convention the situation has improved greatly since the union, a few years ago, of the Regular and the Free Baptists, one condition of which was the understanding that the communion question should not be a matter for controversy outside of the local church. The sequel has been a remarkably rapid growth of open communion sentiment and practise

in churches of this Convention, until now " close communion " is probably the exception, and not the rule.

But this is only a partial solution of the problem. The question of church union is becoming steadily more insistent, and many Baptists feel that the immersion of believers is too narrow a platform to justify much longer their separate denominational existence. This feeling has been greatly strengthened of late by the growth of a more liberal attitude toward theological questions and by developments in the realm of Biblical scholarship. Baptists have fearlessly made their appeal to the best New Testament scholarship, and to the best New Testament scholarship they must be content, eventually, to go. And it is a fact that modern scholarship has shown not only how impossible it is for the well-informed to regard the Bible or even the New Testament as an infallible external authority, but that there are grounds for serious doubt as to whether Jesus ever laid upon his followers any absolute command with regard to baptism. This comes as a welcome relief to many, not only as affording liberation from the bonds of legalistic ritualism, but even more as making it possible to avoid the view that Jesus could have liberated his followers from the fetters of traditional legalism, only to fasten upon them a new formalism and legalism of his own.

But while we hail with satisfaction this growing emancipation of the Baptist people from external authority and a legally binding ritual, we should be very far from assenting to the proposition that belief in the historic Baptist principle of religious liberty is in itself enough to justify belonging to a Baptist church. While Baptists have defended the civil right of the individual to adopt any form of religion not plainly subversive of public morals and public order, they have never meant by religious liberty freedom for the church or for any of its members to be unchristian in faith or practise.

The practical problem confronting the Baptists of today is thus far from simple, and if they would learn the present

duty of the denomination, they must understand both the historic Baptist position and the modern religious situation. The appeal to Baptist history, especially to its beginnings in the Reformation period, makes it abundantly clear that the original Baptist interest was very far from being centered in any legalistic observance of the letter of the New Testament with reference to the form of Christian baptism. On the contrary, as evangelical Protestants the earliest Baptists were primarily interested in spiritual, experiential Christianity. While tending, like other Reformers, to substitute Biblical for ecclesiastical authority, they held strongly to the right of private interpretation of the Scriptures, and while acknowledging the lordship of Christ, they held no less firmly to the view that each individual has direct access to God through Christ, and is thus fully competent, with the Scriptures in his hands and the Holy Spirit in his heart, to learn the Christian way of life without priestly mediation or any such external, authoritative guidance. From the beginning it has been true that the principles which Baptists have regarded as of primary importance have not been those distinctive principles for which at any particular time they may have stood out alone, but rather those principles which were common to them and to other evangelical Christians, such as the redeeming grace of God revealed in Christ, justification by faith, the duty of repentance and obedience to the revealed will of God, and regeneration and ultimate sanctification through the operation of the Spirit of God.

But while as evangelicals the early Baptists were primarily interested in spiritual religion, as Baptists they were interested further and indeed fundamentally in *a spiritual church for the promotion of spiritual religion,* and it was around this ideal of a spiritual church that their historically distinctive principles were at first organized. The point upon which the Swiss Anabaptists took definitive issue with Zwingli was the question as to whether the membership of the Christian church ought not to be composed exclusively of those who

had experienced regeneration as evidenced by a truly Christian faith and life. They were determined to realize, as fully as might be, the ideal of "a church and congregation of the true children of God, who have the Spirit of God and are ruled and led by him." It was for this that they protested against the retention of the common practise of infant baptism, knowing well that, under the circumstances then existing and ideas then prevailing, this practise was bound up inextricably with the institution of a State Church with its membership composed of individuals who had been baptized in infancy but many of whom might nevertheless be total strangers to a vital Christian experience, with the result that the policy of the church could very easily be determined in large part by the unspiritual and unchristian ideals of this "unregenerate" element in its membership. Furthermore, it is of the utmost importance to remember that the original, nonfanatical Anabaptists of the Continent, with all their protest against infant baptism and an unspiritual church, did not insist upon immersion as the only valid form of baptism, but commonly practised pouring instead; and the same thing is almost as certainly true of the earliest English Baptists. Of course these Anabaptists and early Baptists appealed to the New Testament in support of their views when they argued with opponents who also claimed to be restoring New Testament Christianity; but this was incidental and instrumental. It is clear enough that the original distinctive Baptist interest was not in the setting up of a legalistic type of Christianity, but in the founding of a spiritual church for the promotion of spiritual religion. Not unnaturally, as a later development, the appeal to the New Testament as an authoritative standard led to the insistence upon immersion as the only Scripturally authorized form of baptism; but it should never be forgotten that in the beginning it was not sprinkling or pouring to which objection was made, but infant baptism, and this because it was unfavorable to the ideal of a church composed exclusively

of those who were fundamentally Christian in their faith, their experience, and their purpose.

It is in the light of this historic emphasis upon the ideal of a spiritual church that we may most readily understand the various distinctive principles to which historically the Baptists have been devoted. Moreover, if we are to consider the duty of Baptists in the changed modern situation and especially with reference to the project of church union, it is important that we first know and appreciate the distinctive Baptist position in the perspective of history. To this, then, we must briefly turn.

The principles which have been distinctive of Baptists in history may be divided into three groups. First, there were certain basic principles, concerned with the securing of an adequate foundation for a truly spiritual church, that is, for a church which would function as the organ and instrument of the Spirit of Christ, or Holy Spirit. And first among these basic distinctive principles was the cardinal principle, already mentioned, of a regenerate church-membership. If the church was to be spiritual, it must be composed of persons who had experienced spiritual renewal. The two other basic principles are mutually corrective, the one conservative and the other liberal. The conservative principle declared the New Testament to be the only authoritative rule of faith and practise, while the liberal principle was that of religious liberty. These two principles were mutually corrective in the sense that each tended to correct the extreme consequences which would have resulted from following the other exclusively. Taken together these two, the Scriptural standard and religious liberty, were felt to be indispensable to a Christian spiritual life in the individual and in the church. There must be the true light to follow, and the individual and the church must be free to follow that true light.

The second group of distinctive principles we may call derivative, inasmuch as they represent inferences drawn and

applications made on the basis of the fundamental principles just enumerated. These derivative principles were three: First, the equality of all church-members in rights and privileges; second, the independence of the local church; and third, the separation of Church and State. These three derivative principles were principles of spiritual democracy in the church.

The spiritual equality of all members was based on the Protestant doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers. Every individual as indwelt by the Spirit of God, had immediate access to the divine grace and power and guidance; if he lived up to his privilege, he was competent to be his own priest. Such officers as were appointed were not to lord it over the church, but to serve it according to their different gifts and duties, whether as pastors, deacons, teachers, or evangelists. The functions of the various offices in the church were to be discharged with full respect for the spiritual personality and possible divine guidance of every member, even the humblest. This did not necessarily mean that all decisions of a spiritual church ought theoretically to be unanimous; the presence of the divine Spirit could neither supply deficiencies of information nor insure that reasoning would always be strictly logical. It would, nevertheless, tend to promote good-will, and thus a spirit of harmony, even where there might be honest differences of opinion.

The principle of the independence of the local church was felt to be instrumental to the ideal of a spiritual church, for if the local church was to be free to be a spiritual or Spirit-guided church, it must be in a position as a local body to seek the divine guidance directly and to follow such guidance freely. It was not long, however, before it was felt that the independent local churches needed not only to maintain their independence, but also to recognize their interdependence, and thereafter the problem was how to secure the maximum of efficiency in cooperation and mutual help without impairing the spiritual independence of the local church.

The third principle of spiritual democracy in the church, that of the separation of Church and State, was even more essential to the spirituality of the churches than the independence of the local church. Interference on the part of political rulers with the internal affairs of the church would probably have been still more of a menace to divine guidance than the superintendence and authoritative direction of an ecclesiastical hierarchy. And while the right of the church to freedom from political interference with its own internal affairs was insisted upon as indispensable, it was also recognized that it was no more than fair that no church should seek or be allowed in any selfish or undemocratic way to dominate the affairs of state.

Finally, as further principles which found place among the Baptists historically, we must mention some which may be regarded as secondarily instrumental or protective principles, for the reason that they are best understood as meant to protect the ideal of a spiritual church. These were: First, the baptism of believers only; second, immersion as the only form of baptism; third, the restriction of church-membership to baptized (immersed) believers; and fourth, the restriction of the communion to members in good standing of churches of the same faith and order, or at the furthest, to immersed believers. As was intimated above, restriction of church-membership and the communion to immersed believers has not been universal among Baptists; but such restriction has been, in the past at any rate, characteristic of the great majority of Baptists in this country. That the restriction of baptism to Christian believers and of church-membership to the baptized would tend to secure a membership which might well be expected to be amenable to spiritual guidance is sufficiently obvious and has been suggested already. The exclusive recognition of immersion, it must be admitted, at first reflected a growing legalism, and yet, interpreted after the manner of Paul, as symbolical of the believer's fellowship with Christ in

death to sin and resurrection to a new life, it too was made subservient to the spirituality of the church. The value of restricted communion as a protection to the spirituality of the church is more than doubtful; but if it could be justified at all, it would be on the ground of its exercising such a protective function.

We would conclude, then, that the principles which have been distinctive of Baptists, historically, are rightly viewed as having been organized about the ideal of a spiritual Christian church. Either they were felt to be essential as a means, whether more or less directly, to such a church as end, or they seemed to be logically involved in the idea of a Spirit-guided communion.

Viewed in relation to the historical situations in which their distinctive positions were determined, the case for the Baptists was undoubtedly strong. It sometimes happens, however, that time makes ancient good uncouth, and before attempting any practical suggestions as to the duties of Baptists with reference to church union, let us examine more fully than we have yet done the present status and significance of the main principles enumerated above as having been distinctive of Baptists in history.

A thorough discussion of the present status of the historic interest of Baptists and other evangelical Protestants in a truly spiritual type of Christianity, similar to that of the New Testament, would lead us rather far afield. It may not be out of place, however, to refer to the fact that the term "spiritual" has come to be used in a somewhat broader sense than that which prevailed in the older Protestantism. For our fathers the term "spiritual" was distinctively religious; it suggested the holy, awe-inspiring presence and activity of the Divine Being. As Christians, however, they assumed that the presence of the Divine would be evidenced by moral effects; the "spiritual," while distinctively religious, was moral also. But in the last generation or two certain changes have been

taking place which have broadened our conception of the spiritual. It has come to be recognized that whatever values are not merely temporary and instrumental, such as the physically hygienic, the economic, and the political, but are eternally valid and belong to the true and imperative ideals of all personality as such, are truly spiritual. From this point of view the spiritual obviously includes three additional elements besides the distinctively religious and moral. These are, first, the social, in the sense of that which has to do with the brotherhood of man, with true, unselfish love and friendship; second, the intellectual, with its appreciation of the value of knowledge of the truth as an end in itself, and not simply as a means to something else; and third, the esthetic, with its vision of ideal beauty and interest in its expression in human life and in the world about us. Spiritual religion, for the modern mind, must be religion which favors and promotes all of these spiritual values, the intellectual, the esthetic, the social, the moral, and the religious, and in the modern Christian doctrine of immanence, the presence of God, the indwelling Spirit, is recognized in all of these different phases of the ideal or spiritual life. It has always been characteristic of essential Christianity, however, and is characteristic of it still, that it gives special emphasis to the religious, the moral, and the social elements. While not ignoring the claims of science and of art, as all too many Christians have done, we of today can still very well afford to retain what has been the characteristic emphasis of Christianity in other days.

Coming to a consideration of the central ideal about which the distinctive principles of Baptists were organized historically, namely, the ideal of a spiritual church for the promotion of spiritual religion, there seems little occasion for lengthy argument in its defense. We may, for our present purposes, assume its validity, all the more readily for the reason that this ideal has been recognized and applied by other evangelical Protestant churches—with varying degrees of fidelity, it may

be said, but the same qualification applies to Baptist practise also, and it ill becomes the Baptists to indulge in any assumption of spiritual superiority over their fellow Christians of other communions. Still, the ideal of maintaining the spirituality of the church, while it has been very imperfectly realized, is one which may well be kept in the forefront of all discussions looking in the direction of church union.

Assuming then the validity of the ideal of a spiritual church for the promotion of spiritual religion, what is to be said of what we have called the cardinal historic Baptist principle of a converted or regenerate church-membership, particularly in the light of the psychology of religion and the corresponding applied science of religious education? Should not the children of those Christian parents who are members of the church, and perhaps also other children who are in the church school and under the watch-care of the church, be regarded as belonging to the church? Ought they not to be brought up inside the fold and as Christians from the earliest childhood, and to think of themselves as belonging to the kingdom of God and to the church of Christ, as Bushnell maintained in opposition to the Baptists of his day? There is much to be said for such a view, and yet the question is perhaps not quite so one-sided as many modern religious educationalists are inclined to think. We would be very far from suggesting that any child should be encouraged to postpone his experience of religion even to the adolescent period, but it is a fact that many of the most prophetic and influential religious leaders in the history of the church have been men and women who have passed through a religious experience which can be described as nothing less than a spiritual regeneration, and it is perhaps the chief danger of the religious education movement that it may train up a generation of church-members most of whom will be strangers to the deepest things in religious experience, having never made any ever-memorable, whole-hearted decision for Christ and the Christian life, and

having never felt a single thrill of deep religious feeling. There seems to be truth on both sides of the question, however. There is an advantage in having the children brought up in the church, and there is an advantage in having them come into the church on the basis of a definite decision and act of self-dedication to Christ and his cause. What we would suggest, then, is that children who are under the watch-care of the church be regarded as junior associate members, but that full, active membership be deferred until a later time, preferably in adolescence, when the individual can be received into the church on the basis of a normal religious awakening, a whole-hearted personal decision for the Christian life, and a public profession of Christian faith and purpose. For Baptists at least it would be natural to have the recognition of the young child's junior associate membership take the form of a public service of dedication, without baptism, reserving baptism for a later time, when it can serve as a symbolical expression of the individual's own self-conscious decision for Christ and the Christian life and at the same time as an initiatory rite in connection with reception into full and active membership in the church. This distinction between infant or child dedication as the initiatory rite for junior associate membership and baptism as the initiatory rite of self-dedication and reception into active church-membership may well be suggested to Christians of other denominations, particularly in connection with the project of church union; but its universal adoption would not be indispensable in connection with the plan for church union which we shall suggest. What is imperative from the Baptist point of view is that all churches entering into the union admit to full membership only those who have borne credible testimony to Christian faith and Christian purpose, and, each in his own measure, to a vital Christian religious experience. (If adults who can not fulfil this condition are to be in the church at all, it should be only as senior associate members who approve in a general way

what the church stands for in the community, not as full members whose votes might determine the moral and religious policies of the church. Perhaps it would be better to let the associate membership lapse in the case of adults who do not come into full active membership.

Another point to be made is that if Baptists are to be satisfied to enter into an organic union of Christian churches, their historic principles of religious liberty and the Scriptural standard of faith and practise must be adequately safeguarded. The Scriptural standard was so widely adopted by other Protestant denominations, and religious liberty has met with such well-nigh universal favor in democratic countries, that these principles have largely ceased to be distinctive of Baptists, and it might seem unnecessary to give them special attention, save to remark that it would be more in keeping with the modern understanding of the Bible to formulate the Scriptural principles as loyalty to Christ, interpreting the phrase more in terms of the spirit than of the letter, as loyalty to what Christ stands for in human life. But there is at least one aspect of the combination of the liberal and the conservative principle which calls for emphasis. The principle of the New Testament as the only rule of faith and practise has been appealed to by Baptists almost as much in its negative as in its positive aspect, and more in the interests of Christian liberty than of conservatism. That is to say, historically Baptists have constantly maintained that no fixed form of creedal statement should be imposed upon the individual Christian, the local church, or the denomination, as externally authoritative and binding. As individuals, as churches and as groups of churches, they have produced declarations of faith from time to time, but such statements have always been regarded by well-informed Baptists, not as tests of belief but as testimonies of faith; it has always been recognized that the religious subject was free to substitute his own statement of Christian faith for the historic declarations.

When we pass on to a consideration of the principles of spiritual democracy, there seems but little that needs to be said in criticism of the historic formulations. With reference to the spiritual equality of all members of the church, it must be said that Baptists can never afford to recognize any priestly class as having been set on a higher spiritual plane by virtue of any sacrament of ordination, regarded as the channel of a magical impartation of divine grace *ex opere operato*. There is no reason why the hands of the clock should be turned back from spiritual religion to superstitious magic.

In connection with the mutual relations of Church and State, problems with reference to the securing of untrammeled scientific instruction and adequate moral and religious education in State schools and colleges are pressing for solution. Manifestly it is the prerogative of the State to teach genuine scientific knowledge on any subject, however closely it may concern the life of religion; but on the other hand no state school has any right to teach either theological dogmas or dogmatic opinions and interpretations of an antireligious sort, as if they were established scientific knowledge.

The principle of the independence of the local church demands special attention in connection with our problem. Shall the polity of the united church of the future be of the Congregational, the Presbyterian, or the Episcopal type? The question is important for Baptists, for the reason that while they fully recognize the interdependence of the churches, and have developed a complex denominational organization of district associations of churches, State and national conventions with their missionary, educational, and publication societies or boards, and a Baptist World Alliance, they have always sought to make such organizations legislative only for themselves, and simply executive and advisory in relation to the local churches, which are thus left entirely autonomous, settling for themselves their own legislative and judicial problems. There will be strong resistance among Baptists to any

suggestion that they surrender this autonomy of the local church, and the justification of such resistance is to be found in the ideal of a spiritual church, free at all times to follow the guidance of the Spirit without interference on the part of any supposedly "higher" ecclesiastical authority.

But can it be reasonably expected that denominations which have long been habituated to government by presbyters or by bishops will be willing to change to the extent of adopting the system of government by the local congregation? Probably not, at least in the near future. Does this mean, then, that the project of organic union of the principal Protestant denominations in our day is hopeless? Not necessarily. It is our purpose to suggest a plan of organic church union to which the difficulty in question would apparently not prove fatal. Before outlining such a plan, however, let us consider briefly the present status of those Baptist principles which we have called secondarily instrumental, or protective.

Beginning with the last on the list, close communion, it may be said that this has undoubtedly outlasted any usefulness it may ever have had, and it is cause for profound thankfulness that among American Baptists of the Northern Convention it is fast becoming obsolete. This change, now going on, to the position long occupied by the great majority of British Baptists, among whom all followers of Christ are invited to the Lord's table, will, when it is complete, prove to have been a long step on the part of the Baptists in the direction of church union. It is also a fact that scores if not hundreds of Baptist churches in the Northern Convention have taken a further step in the direction of church union, in receiving by letter into their church fellowship, and in a considerable number of instances into full active membership, members of other churches who have never been immersed. This, as is well known, is also a very common practise among English Baptists, by whom it is recognized as resting logically on the very defensible principle that baptism and the Lord's

Supper are symbolic acts voluntarily observed by the individual Christian, not compulsory ordinances of the church. Observance of these forms may well be urged upon the Christian on grounds of their symbolical significance, their historical associations, and their psychological value; but they ought not to be made indispensable conditions of membership in the church. The one rightly indispensable condition of membership in a Christian church is that one be Christian in faith, experience, and purpose.

The importance of this growing tendency to return to the original Baptist emphasis upon the spiritual rather than the ritualistic conditions of church-membership lies in the fact that it indicates a path toward organic church union which would neither on the one hand require Baptists to administer baptism otherwise than as at present, that is, as the immersion of believers, nor on the other hand involve waiting until non-Baptists were ready to adopt the Baptist practise as to the mode and subjects of baptism. To require any high degree of uniformity as a condition of church union would only mean the indefinite postponement of the end contemplated.

We are now ready to propose a basis of church union.

1. Let all local churches, of whatever denomination, in order to safeguard the Christian character and spirituality of the local churches and denominations entering into the union, require of each and every candidate for full, active membership credible evidence of Christian faith, Christian experience, and a Christian life-purpose, such evidence to include the candidate's own statement, even when he comes with a letter of dismission from another local church, whether of the same or of a different denomination.

2. In connection with a candidate's personal statement of Christian faith, let it be understood that the local church receiving the candidate does not necessarily endorse his creedal statement, but simply judges his faith, in the sense of his religious attitude, to be essentially Christian.

3. While local churches, groups of churches, and denominations may adopt or retain such forms as they may choose, whether of creedal statement, internal organization, or ritual, including such symbolical rites as baptism, the Lord's Supper, and ordination, let it be understood that neither any such form nor the lack of it shall constitute a barrier to inclusion within the united church organization, the one and only indispensable condition of such inclusion being, besides a desire to be included, credible evidence of Christian faith, experience, and purpose.

4. Let a united Christian church, or organic union of denominations be organized by accredited representatives, duly authorized to act in this capacity, it being understood that such union will leave the distinctive features of each uniting denomination intact, except as modifications may be made at the time or later by denominations, groups of churches, or single local churches themselves.

5. Let such local unions of different denominational churches be formed as may seem desirable and possible to the local churches concerned.

6. Let such district, State or provincial, national, and international organizations of the united church be formed as may seem desirable, the delegates to meetings of such general bodies being given only an executive and advisory function with reference to the component local or denominational bodies.

7. Let a division of duties and functions between the general bodies of the united church and the general bodies of the component denominations be arranged by mutual agreement. That is, let the general body or bodies of the united church assume, if they wish, such functions as may be delegated to them by the denominations, in harmony with the constitutions of those denominations, and let the general body or bodies of the united church also be free to suggest to the component denominations that they assign to the united church certain

functions, leaving it to the denominations to accept or reject any such suggestion.

The above recommendations, it is believed, state the essential conditions of a satisfactory union of Christian denominations. The probable result of union on this basis would be the increasing importance of the united body and its acts, and the diminishing significance of the component denominations as distinct and separate units. The analogy of the United States is instructive. In order, however, that the united church, once organized, might increase, and undue denominationalism decrease, the following additional recommendations may be suggested:

8. Let all churches observing the rite of the Lord's Supper practise open communion, or, in other words, impose no condition of participation save the spiritual condition of a genuine Christian discipleship.

9. Let letters of dismission be granted by the local church to members in good standing who may wish to unite with a church of another denomination.

10. Let local churches receiving members by letter from other denominations and by personal testimony, as provided in the first recommendation above, impose no absolute requirement on such members either as to ritual act or as to creedal subscription.

There are many other recommendations which might be suggested, as making for the removing of such denominational differences as are a barrier to Christian fellowship and cooperation, but these which we have mentioned are perhaps the most important. Christians of different denominations have long known that there can be a high degree of unity of spirit in spite of great outward diversity; it is now about time to demonstrate that there can be an effective organic union without absolute external conformity to any one model. *Unity without uniformity* is largely an achievement, the next step must be *union without uniformity*.

# ART AND DRAMATISM IN WORSHIP

The Late Professor EUGENE EDMOND AYRES
Crozer Theological Seminary

In a special psychological study of the religious life, public worship has been defined as "being religious under the favorable influences of a special environment." Professor Geo. W. Knox of Union Theological Seminary declared that men seek church and temple for the sake of a certain emotional experience. In the history of the world a great variety of emotions have been cherished as religious, some of which were noble and others undoubtedly depraved.

Sometimes, nay often, emotion is cherished solely for itself, being esteemed the whole of religion. In heathen cults this is found in depraved forms, confounded with emotions aroused by cruelty and more commonly with those of sex and intoxication. Unrestrained license may be given to the passions, and drugs and liquors used to produce a sacred drunkenness. Or bodily movements may accomplish the same end. For example the shouting and whirling dervishes and ignorant multitudes among ourselves regard exhaustion and catalepsy as evident tokens of the divine presence. The persistence of these forms of religion and their recrudescence in our day of enlightenment illustrates how strong are such emotions and how imperatively they demand gratification. The church may minister to the emotions by solemn music, stately ritual, majestic structures, and great congregations.

A distinctively Christian service must cherish definitely Christian emotions, such as give reality to the great Christian verities, and furnish a motive power to the Christian life. A religious service is not Christian if it does not tend to make the God of Jesus real to us, and furnish an eternal background to our active every-day life. It is not Christian if it does not tend to strengthen the conviction of the reality of the brotherhood of man—if it does not cause the individual worshiper to exclaim with searching of heart, "Surely I am indeed my brother's keeper"! The Christian religion is an ethical relig-

ion, and the natural and appropriate expression of such a religion is Christian conduct. Only such emotions as tend to such expression should be cherished in Christian worship. "Christian public worship is simply a device for developing the moral control of conduct."

When we come to study the details of worship we find two widely different conceptions as to the best method of achieving the desired result, which we have assumed to be Christian conduct. There is a form of public worship which is a dramatic representation of Christian ideas. This is sometimes called impressive worship. There is, on the other hand, a service which is primarily social expression, in which every part of the service is supposed to represent the religious ideals and aspirations of the group of worshipers assembled. We have heard much in our day of the necessity of blending these two elements; and there are many who sincerely believe it possible to contrive a service in which both impressive and expressive elements shall be present. Whether we may regard the attempt as successful or not, we should for the sake of clearness distinguish carefully between the two conceptions. The differences usually pointed out are superficial and are not the essential differences. For example, it is not enough to speak of the sermon as an impressive element in which God through his servant speaks to the congregation, and of prayer as an expressive element in which the people approach the throne of grace. This may very well express the naïve psychological situation as it formerly existed in many Christian assemblies, but we are now in need of a more careful statement of the facts. The sermon may prove to be an expressive element, the preacher being a mere member of the congregation speaking for his brethren, leading them at their request in their religious meditation; the prayer may be, and frequently is, an impressive element, dramatic and imposing, and may attract attention to itself as a work of art, or to its composer if it be extemporaneous. In fact the whole service may be

made dramatic in all its parts; or the whole service may be regarded as socially expressive. The two ideals are antagonistic, and perhaps mutually destructive.

The dramatic conception of public worship is not the earliest in the history of the Christian religion. It was developed in the course of the centuries, as the great Christian institutions developed. Jesus had magnified private prayer rather than public devotions nicely calculated with a view to impression. He was student enough of Comparative Religion and of human nature to declare that the heathen as well as the Pharisees were given to vain repetitions. And Christian public worship has had its perils from the beginning. The worship of the first disciples, under the personal influence of Jesus, was anything but artistic. It was the simple unadorned expression of their common religious experience. It is not easy to trace the transition from such simplicity to the imposing and complicated ritual of the Middle Ages. Church history throws little light upon it; few echoes of the discussion of ritual motives come to our ears. We hear something of heathen critics who speak with derision of the Christian churches because of their lack of the accessories supposed to be necessary to worship. The Christians had no temples, altars, priests, or liturgies. Prayer was the free utterance of the impassioned heart. The prophets were permitted to give thanks as much as they pleased. (Didache X.) "The president offered prayers according to his ability" (Justin Martyr, Apol., c. LXVII). For some time it was the boast of Christian apologists that they needed neither temple nor sacrifice nor altar, but that their worship was spiritual, consisting in the offering of a grateful heart and a righteous life to a purely spiritual being. (Cf. Allen, "Christian Institutions," p. 428.)

But the churches were face to face with a very practical problem. The world was full of religions that had temples and impressive ceremonies, the people were ignorant and

superstitious. It was felt that the Christian religion was bound to compete with its rivals, to avail itself of their methods and rites and forms. So heathen symbols and forms of worship, and sometimes their orgies, were simply transferred to the church and consecrated to the service of the Christian religion. Public worship at any rate ceased to be a congregational function, an occasion for the expression of congregational experience. It became the opportunity of the clergy to instruct and to impress the silent laity. The clergy were regarded as the representatives of the Lord, and the service became wholly impressive.

We may easily criticize too severely this period of Christian history. It is more difficult to enter with scholarly insight and sympathy into the situation as it really was. Professor Allen is probably right when he asserts that institutions and beliefs that seem irrational or absurd or unworthy of the Christian spirit have come into vogue in order to kill some deeper evils, not otherwise to have been destroyed. He describes the cultus of the Catholic Church as one vast effort to put a religious stamp upon both time and space, and thus to conquer for Christ the visible and invisible worlds. The calendar year was thus rescued from the heathen and made a church year, and heathen religious festivals were turned to Christian uses. The mass was developed into a great drama. "It was as if the Heavenly King were holding a reception." It was most appropriate that there should be magnificent vestments, accessories of light and music, perfume and color, and the punctilious performance of religious etiquette. It was a "dramatization of the soul's relations with God, an exaggerated formality incompatible with worship in spirit and truth." It was an esthetic appeal, and as Allen says, "anesthetic in its results" ("Christian Institutions," p. 549).

Many wise and thoughtful men are convinced that the two elements of impression and of expression can never be satisfactorily blended. Many others do not apparently see just

where the difficulty lies while they sadly mourn the failure of our modern religious service. Professor A. V. G. Allen speaks of worship as a "lost art." President Faunce says that

> A wave of social consciousness is sweeping over the land and at the same time a wave of recession from public worship. The tide of corporate endeavor is at the full, but the tide of corporate devotion mysteriously ebbs. The disinclination to assemble for public worship exists most obviously among the devout and the thoughtful. Ordinary worship fails to meet the vital needs of the people.

He quotes Sir Oliver Lodge as saying that "People go away from worship with a feeling of irritation and regret for wasted time." "Never," continues Faunce, "was there so deep a sense of moral values as now, and never so little inclination to join in ordered acts of public worship." It would be easy to quote such opinions by the hour. Is it not time for us to ask ourselves seriously just what is the matter? It is certainly not because men have less sympathy for Christian institutions or for Christian ideals than formerly, or that they have less concern for things spiritual. This is true, however, that men in general are coming to recognize the truth of the early Christian contention that public worship is not the whole of the religious life and is not by any means an infallible test of one's Christian character. In the second century Christians were regarded by some of their neighbors as irreligious, not because they repudiated the heathen religions, but because they made so little of any kind of public worship. It was the heathen fashion to judge the religious life by temple-treading and by attention to liturgy. Mincius Felix answered these critics thus:

> He who cultivates innocence supplicates God; he who cultivates justice makes offerings to God; he who abstains from fraudulent practises propitiates God; he who snatches his fellow man from danger slaughters the most acceptable victim. These are our sacrifices, these are our rites of God's worship. Among us he who is most just is most religious.

The criterion by which a Christian should be judged is not the heathen criterion—his attitude toward stated public worship—but his whole attitude toward life, his every-day sense of the Fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man. We are not pharisaical enough in our day to deny the possibility of a man's absenting himself from stated worship for the sake of doing something better than merely to be seen at prayer. Mr. Dwight L. Moody is reported as having said that if he were a young man he would not attend the Sunday-evening service. If this modern recrudescence of the early Christian attitude toward public worship be wrong, our Baptist fathers are largely responsible for it. Public worship is recognized as a specialized function of the religious life, as only a single form of religious activity.

This brings us to close quarters with the problem as it exists in our day. We are learning more and more to distinguish things that differ. Increasing specialization is a marked feature of our modern civilization. The religious service that fails to be something distinctly apart from everything else fails absolutely. The church can not afford in the twentieth century to compete with other institutions. As all other institutions are highly specialized with a view to the highest possible efficiency, so must the church discover her special function and give herself unreservedly to it. This service that is a hybrid of scientific discussion and artistic music and congregational prayer is a failure from every point of view, pedagogical, artistic, and religious.

There was a time when the church could give some popular instruction. There were multitudes of naïve ignorant and superstitious laymen who were willing to take their science and philosophy and history and their moral and religious ideas without question from the clergy. That conception of the function of the church is dead. The church must not set itself up as a rival of the college or university. The great preachers are not teachers when they enter the pulpit. They may be

sound scholars, and it is most desirable that they should be. They have a more difficult task than that of the teacher. They may have all the gifts of the teacher and may find use for these gifts in the Sunday school and in specially appointed lecture courses, and especially in private conversation. All the gifts of formal scientific exposition that the preacher may possess he will find abundant opportunity to use. But when he is conducting a religious service he is no longer a schoolmaster. He has a congregation of all sorts and conditions of men. Formal teaching in such circumstances is impossible, from the modern point of view undesirable. No one would think of turning to a volume of sermons, whether by Beecher or Brooks or Spurgeon or Jowett or R. J. Campbell, for information or instruction. No good sermon appreciably increases our store of knowledge. The most elementary text-book on any subject is better for teaching purposes. Not even Bible teaching finds any place in the pulpit; for such expositions as those of Alexander Maclaren and Campbell Morgan are not intended as instructive expositions addressed to the intellect, but devout meditations expressive of the religious experience. Such preaching is not impressive but expressive. It is not distinct from worship but is a most important part of it. The preaching that is mere popular entertainment is distinct from worship; and so is all teaching and in fact everything that is merely impressive. A teacher is consciously and purposely didactic. He questions himself thus: "How can I best teach others the things that I know and influence them aright?" The preacher must say, "How can I best express the highest things we know and feel in common?" Henry Clay said of John Gano: "Of all the preachers I ever listened to he made me feel the most that religion was a divine reality. I never felt so religious under any one's preaching." Such preaching is removed as far as possible from teaching. It disarms all criticism and brings the listener to the noblest self-expression.

All dramatic or impressive forms of worship tend to

evoke in any Protestant congregation the spirit of criticism. The teacher makes a conscious and unmistakable challenge to our critical faculties. The moment criticism begins, worship, as a distinct exercise of the spiritual man, dies. No one in our day is willing to relinquish his duty as a critic. To learn how to criticize independently and fearlessly is an indispensable part of a twentieth century education. No one will surrender his commission to think for himself, especially at this hour when it is coming to be the way of all the world. So when we ministers undertake to teach our congregations they will regard us with critical eyes as they should. When we offer them courses of lectures on Sociology, or Christian Ethics, or Religious History, or even on the Bible itself we must take our chances with our critics as any other lecturer must do. And it may become the preacher's duty to lecture on just such subjects if he happens to have special knowledge of these matters and hearers who wish to receive such instruction as he is competent to give. But in the hour of public worship his duty is quite different. Fortunate is that preacher who has sympathy, and spiritual insight, sense of the presence of God, and the feeling of intimate fellowship with his brethren, in other words, the religious genius that enables him to lead his congregation in devout meditation on religious themes. Such a man is the accepted mouthpiece of the congregation and his hearers will no more criticize him than they will criticize themselves. But a teacher inevitably stands aloof from his hearers.

What is true of the sermon is true of every other part of the service. The religious service was the mother of the arts. Dancing and the drama and the oratorio had their beginning in public worship. But in this age of specialization we no longer dance in our religious services. Acting still has some recognition in the pulpit, and dramatic appeal and studied elocutionary effects are not entirely unknown to us. Music is the only art that is still allowed to have pretty much her own

way in the service. And her own way is the artistic way, the way of dramatic impression. It would be a very beautiful way if it were not hindered by so many incongruous elements, such as Scripture readings, prayers, and sermons, and worst of all, congregational hymns. In our day a musical artist is known not only by his skill in playing or singing but also by the taste he displays in the construction of his program. No religious service can be contrived in such a way as to make a satisfactory artistic program. "A perfect work of art is a perfectly organized presentation of an original unity. If apples are found on one bough and figs on another, men guess that the whole thing is a sham." Holman Hunt said: "Throughout my life I have looked upon the artificiality of religious art with despair. It seems impossible to cure the evil" (*Contemporary Magazine*, 1897, p. 41). He quotes Dean Stanley as follows:

> I thought at least in Catholic churches we should see the greatest taste in the decoration of their altars; but instead of refined arrangement, I see the vulgarest display of dolls with tinsely crinolines such as the tawdriest shops in London would not have in their windows.

It will be a great thing for our churches when we come to realize the fact that we are trying to make a blend of incongruous elements. The sooner we discover the futility of the effort the better. It is the custom of modern writers to concede the failure of our present efforts and to predict the birth of a new religious consciousness and the elaboration of new forms of service. These new forms are expected to express the entire nature of man. Instead of using old forms, old hymns, old prayers, old scriptures, old architecture and art

it will gather up in one inclusive act of sacrifice all that the modern ages have contributed to the knowledge of God. The sacrifice will include every department of human interest and inquiry—music, art, and poetry, as well as science, philosophy, and theology. (Cf. Allen, "Christian Institutions," p. 494.)

But does not this overlook the fact that public worship is only a single special function of the religious life? And is not the conception itself vitiated by its evident impracticability?

There is a large and noble place in a Christian civilization for the ministry of the fine arts, but that place is not in church. Even the Roman Catholic Church, in spite of its emphasis upon dramatic impression, is growing more and more dissatisfied with the higher forms of church music. In the new Catholic Encyclopedia there is an interesting article on Music by Gietman in which the following words are found:

> It is very much to be regretted that the greatest masters, Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, devoted their wonderful gifts mainly to secular uses, and that their masses are entirely unsuitable for liturgical purposes—an unsuitability freely acknowledged by Mendelssohn, Liszt, and Wagner. The Gregorian chant is the norm. Theatrical music is as much out of place in church as the performance of a secular drama, the exposition of a battle scene, or a statue representing a pagan deity. The performance of such music directs attention not to the altar, but to the organ-loft.

This writer argues:

> Since modern music has arisen mainly to serve profane ends, care must be taken that musical compositions admitted to the church contain nothing profane, and be free from reminiscences of theatrical motives.

Our Protestant churches do not exercise any such care. A hundred years ago, however, a new tune as harmless as Old Hundred could not be used in a Baptist church without special consideration by the church. The masses of Mozart and Beethoven are far less theatrical than much of the music heard in our ambitious twentieth-century churches. The Catholic writer touches the very heart of the problem when he condemns such music as directs attention to the organ-loft. It might be beautiful in a concert where we could give our undivided attention to the work of art, its form and its various artistic qualities, and to its interpreters the players and singers; where we could exercise our esthetic judgment and discrimi-

nation and skill in musical criticism to our hearts' content. Such concerts might well be given under church auspices and in church buildings. It would be a beautiful expression of the religious life of the community if the church doors could be opened once every week to the public in order that the people might come in to hear an organ recital or a fine concert by the choir without prayer or Scripture or other liturgy. But let it be frankly announced as a concert and not as a service even if it be given on the Sabbath Day.

No enlightened man will question the importance of the fine arts in our modern life. No well-instructed Christian will quarrel with his best friends and helpers in the work of civilizing and redeeming the world. Our modern poets, painters, and musicians are profound interpreters of human life, and many of them are helping the preacher of the gospel gloriously. Here are some who are painting the pathos of the working life the poetry of toil, the saints of the field, the madonnas of the cottage, the angels of the hearthside. The arts vie with one another in their attempt to portray the sacredness of life, its struggle, endurance, grandeur. These arts we must cherish not only because they are among the comeliest children of the church, but also because they are competent heaven-sent helpers in the work of Christ. Art has actual religious value for us whenever we can get out of it encouragement by every means in our power to do our duty. The esthetic emotions are so closely akin to religious emotions that they are frequently identified. William Blake considered art and religion as but two names for the same thing:

> I know of no other Christianity and of no other gospel than the liberty of both body and mind to exercise the divine arts of imagination. Christ and the imagination are convertible terms. The man who is not either a poet, painter, or musician is not a Christian. Prayer is the study of art, praise is the practice of art.

But all such identification of the esthetic and the religious emotions is rhetoric and enthusiasm, and not psychology.

More scientific men see some very great differences between esthetic and religious satisfactions. Professor Slaughter of Clark University, wrote some time ago an article for the *International Journal of Ethics* in which he carefully distinguished between them while showing their similarity. He represents music and religion as formidable rivals for analogous emotional claims in human nature. He predicts a victory for music, claiming, rashly perhaps, that most people attend church nowadays for the sake of the music alone. The religious service will eventually cease to be necessary. Music the beautiful substitute will take its place. "In so far as any part of a service is a work of art it fails of its religious purpose." Professor George Santyana of Harvard also contrasts the two attitudes by showing that the esthetic emotion is satisfied with itself, while religious emotion points to something beyond. "Poetry is a mere phantom, beautiful and satisfying, but an acknowledged phantom; religion is a phantom also, but a phantom guide for our lives." Which is only another way of saying that one has ethical content and the other has not. A work of art professes to point to no reality beyond itself. There we rest satisfied with the beautiful achievement, the wonderful creation of the artist. There is the story of the fashionable Russian lady who heartlessly left her coachman to wait and to freeze to death at the door of the theater while she wept all the evening over some pathetic artistic portrayal of human suffering. It takes something else besides art to make Christians out of us. The esthetic emotions have in themselves no ethical power. They lack the force that impels to moral conduct.

There are too many temptations on every hand to indulge the emotions without a thought of the duties and obligations of life. The church should sternly refuse to encourage such moral indifference. The fine arts cannot help us to make this a better world if the church fails to do her duty—to give ethical direction to our emotions.

One other important difference between artistic enjoyment and worship should be noted. Art is essentially aristocratic; it emphasizes certain differences among men—differences of insight, of creative talent, of power and native ability and of training. Such differences actually exist in the world, and the enlightened man must recognize them. The artist is a symbol of all that genuine aristocracy stands for. Henry VIII was right when he declared that he could take seven peasants and make seven noblemen out of them; but he could not take seventy noblemen and make a single artist out of them. The artist in the exercise of his art, stands apart from the rank and file of men. But a religious service should emphasize something deeper than all our differences—our common humanity, our common utter dependence upon a common Father, our common needs and joys and hopes and fears. A genuine religious service must be democratic.

Professor H. S. Nash, of Cambridge, says:

> With us the Arts are independent of religion. This is the reverse of the situation in antiquity and in the Middle Ages. Formerly the religious consciousness and the sense of the beautiful slipped into each other without being aware of a break. But with us it is not so. We are apt to be aware of something going on more or less like the jar produced by the coupling of cars, when we pass from one to the other.

Anything that attracts our attention to the glorious achievements of men who are more gifted than ourselves is incongruous and out of place in a service where we little human beings are supposed to huddle together for one brief hour of fellowship. Worship if it is to persist must be understood as something entirely distinct from artistic entertainment. Let it be said to the credit of the great musicians that they have, some of them at least, seen this more clearly than most modern preachers. Richard Wagner, in 1848, ascribed the decadence of church music to the introduction of the organ. It was his opinion that appropriate church music could only be produced by voices. C. H. Parry, one of the eminent of modern com-

posers and now Professor of Music at Oxford University, England, said in his address on Style in Music at the International Congress, Saint Louis, in 1904:

> Style has to do with what is proper. Take the old church music [referring to tunes like St. Ann's and Dundee], its contemplative and devotional character, its spirituality and inwardness are partly due to the limited artistic development of the sixteenth century. The style is so consistent that hardly anything in the range of modern art can compare with it. The instant secular music came into being, the devotional was submerged, and we now have a hybrid of the most mixed quality, redolent of the nauseous vulgarities of the opera.

President Faunce, in *The American Journal of Theology*, January, 1910, points out some of the faults of our services, among which he enumerates crudeness and fragmentariness, Scripture read as a text-book on elocution, prayer as a harangue addressed to the audience, which produces the effect of hypocrisy, and music, admirable from the esthetic point of view but irrelevant as an aid to worship. In most churches the task of the preacher is rendered vastly more difficult by the intrusion of incongruous or impertinent music. Note the significant fact that Doctor Parry finds the appropriateness of the old hymn-tunes for religious uses partly in their inartistic character. The tunes are like the words of our best hymns, simple, sincere, heartfelt media of expression for the whole congregation. Nothing in music is more inartistic than congregational singing. But when a congregation can forget the organ-loft, and put away musical etiquette, and sing a simple hymn such as " All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name " as if each and every member of the congregation was composing the hymn and tune on the spot—the spirit of worship is likely to be present.

Competition with more efficient institutions in their own proper sphere is deadly, and it will be more so as culture becomes more general. Even the half-educated man will choose a good book or a good lecture course for instruction

in preference to any possible series of sermons. Musical people will not go to a religious service to hear music. They will have the good taste to show their preference for artistic programs with no incongruous elements; and these they will find at their best in concert halls.

# READJUSTMENTS OF THE MODERN MINISTER

President FRANK L. ANDERSON
International Theological Seminary, East Orange, N. J.

AUTOCRACY is not a popular word in the twentieth century. The mighty autocrats of life have been thrust from their seats and the multitudes have been given a voice and a right to think and to act. The autocracy of ancient custom or opinion can no longer maintain itself. The present restless, throbbing, living age believes that God spoke to Moses; it also believes that God is speaking today.

Man finds himself confronted with a new world of thought in which he lives and moves. The world that is is not like the world that was. This creates problems. He must take some stand. He cannot remain neutral. He may accept the old because it is old, or the new because it is new. The thinker, the worker, the man of truth and of judgment, buckles down to the task of doing justice to both, not in a spirit of compromise, but in a spirit of honest valuation of the truth that may be found in either.

The minister has a twofold task in this strenuous and responsible duty. He must first of all make it a personal problem. His conclusions must come out of genuine thought, sincerity of soul, honest facing of the problems raised. This means conviction based on inner achievement. He is also a teacher and leader of his people. He must prepare what is truth to him for the instruction of different minds in as many stages of culture or of religious experience. The more difficult task is to understand the mind of his hearers, and then take out of the storehouse of his thought and experience what may help their lives. Then, and only then, is he a true teacher of babes as well as of men. For in truth, he must make sure that he provides for the spiritual well-being of all classes of those who look to him to be fed.

## I. The Historical Background of Present-day Problems

Every problem has a history. To approach the present-day thinking without learning the lessons of the past would be to neglect the most helpful of all methods of readjusting our thought to the ever-changing life of our day. Dean Stubbs says,

> The roots of the present lie deep in the past, and nothing in the past is dead to the man who learns how the present comes to be what it is.

As we read the Old Testament we discover that the men of those distant days were constantly called upon to restudy personal and common problems. Abraham moved out of one civilization into another. He went into an unknown country in which he could not evade the new duties that sprang out of the new environment. Probably he never had a more heart-rending problem than when he heard his own son ask the question, "Where is a lamb for a burnt offering?" He had been obedient to a heathen theology which he regarded as one with loyalty to God. But the moment he raised his knife to slay his son he heard a new voice commanding, "Lay not thy hand upon the lad." The great spiritual pioneer was rewarded for his loyalty to God and was shown a new way of expressing his devotion to God.

The people of Israel were emancipated from the bondage of their past under the leadership of Moses and Joshua. They were no doubt glad, at least at first, that they were no longer under the old order of things. They began to murmur, however. They made golden calves as they had done in Egypt. They were afraid to possess the new land. It was full of giants. They could not go back, they would not go forward. They just died where they were. But not all. There were some who would find a new country—and a new country they established. Adjust they must, and adjust they did.

Later we find the prophets facing a new age and new

conditions. New light was coming from God to the people who could see because they were prepared to see. The narrower view of God had obtained till the days of Amos, who announced the fact that the God of Israel was the God of Damascus, of Edom, of Moab, as well as of the chosen people of God. This view became clearer in the vision and teaching of Isaiah, and more especially of the great prophet of the exile. Israel has a universal God and therefore must cease to be an isolated, self-centered people. She must lead in the enlightenment of the whole world. But there were Jonahs in those days who protested against the universalism of the greater, wider vision that had been caught by those who were following God. Some held tenaciously to the old and set their souls against the new. The prophet of the return with his message of grace expressed in the sufferings of the Servant grows discouraged at times and cries out of his breaking heart, "Who has believed our report?" The great prophets sensed a new age lying, not in the past, but in the future. They would have the nation adjust itself to the new vision. A few heard the voice and followed. The rest remained where they were.

The long-expected Messiah came in the fulness of time. The nation was stirred from Dan to Beersheba. Multitudes followed the forerunner. Later the people would force Jesus to become king of Israel. The new leader disappointed rulers and people till finally they crucified him. He was not a military Messiah. His closest followers could not accept the tragedy, and after his resurrection hoped that he might do what he had not done before—restore the kingdom to Israel. There was still that narrow Jonah-Ezra view of Israel's mission to the world. Pentecost itself was a Jewish-Christian experience. There was no thought of a gospel for the Gentile as a Gentile. It was for the chosen people alone. Peter was great on Pentecost. He was also ignorant of the problem he had to face when he saw that a Cornelius, a Gentile, had received the Holy Spirit. A new world now lay before the

great apostle—and he must adapt himself to it. He was no more disobedient to the heavenly vision than was the greater apostle. When the vision came to Paul there was no going back? But how to live in the new light that demanded thought and quietness? He was forced to reinterpret the past and see it in its relation to the new era that had dawned. It would have been easy for Paul to reject all that was old. He chose the more strenuous duty. He felt that the new was the deepest life of the old. Instead of being untrue or disloyal to that past, he claimed that he established it by accepting the light that had been foretold in the foregleams visible to Abraham, Moses, and the prophets.

What problems the new church had to face because of the old economy out of which it had grown! The environment which was heathen called for adjustment on the part of that early church. There were problems of meat sacrificed to idols, association with heathen neighbors, duty to a heathen government, and human slavery. They must find a *modus vivendi,* or depart out of this world, as Paul suggested.

The more mature church was confronted with a state that was friendly and protective in its attitude at first and later compulsory. As we follow those years of struggle between Church and State there is revealed to us the acuteness of the perplexing questions that must be answered. Should the State control the Church, or should the Church control the State, or could there be found a basis for the division of authority and jurisdiction so each could live peacefully with the other in a united society? They were no doubt as serious in their effort to find a solution as we are today. There was something they could not control with which they must reckon. They could either oppose or follow. A middle ground could not be found. Some saw the light, dim as it was, ahead of them—and followed, others were seeking to obstruct the forward movement of the world and gradually and inevitably fell by the wayside.

There are but two more turning-points we shall notice in our rapid historical survey. The Dark Ages were not so dark as they have been pictured. They were the birth-throes of the later ages. The Roman Empire was broken up into small parts by racial groups that knew not Cæsar and Augustus. It seemed as if Cosmos was reverting to Chaos. The world was merely excavating for new foundations on which to build a new order of society. Feudalism grew up and passed away as a plant matures and withers under the changing physical environment. The rebirth of Europe was a result of forces that had lain latent but were in no sense dead. The monasteries had preserved within their walls dynamics that were later to overthrow the past forms of life and help in the more difficult task of building a new order of things that would recognize two facts—man, and the world in which man was making his home. Man from this time on must adjust his thinking and living to two view-points, the one that we may speak of as the natural, the other as supernatural. The former view expresses "confidence in human evidence; a desire to cultivate oneself as a human being." Man begins to experiment in order to discover truth. He has a growing confidence in his own powers of observation—of discovering reality by direct contact with the facts of life. The supernatural must function in the natural—in man and in nature—in order to establish itself as truth in the experience of man. The supernatural can no longer justify itself by supernatural evidence. It must come into nature and into man as a force that can and will be domesticated. It must cease to be an exotic.

The men who saw had to pay the price of loyalty to this vision. Galileo was compelled to recant, Copernicus ran the gauntlet of misinterpretation, Newton was declared an atheist because he put gravitation in the place of God, Kepler is ridiculed and imprisoned, Luther called Copernicus a fool, Calvin condemned all who "asserted that the earth is not the center

of the universe" and quoted Scripture against the position of the great Polish astronomer. But men found that they could believe in the new science, in the Bible, and in God at the same time.

In the nineteenth century the world had to face a new view of life. There were foregleams even among the Greeks of the view that the appearance of "The Origin of Species" in 1859 compelled intelligent people to reckon with. Evolution was not a new idea to educated people in 1859. Sir Charles Lyell's Principles of Geology had appeared in 1830. In 1774 Herder wrote:

> The past and the present are the basis of the future . . . . The Egyptian could not be without the Oriental; the Greek built on both; the Roman rose upon the shoulders of the entire world.

There have been, and no doubt are still, men who think that the rejection of Darwinism is the overthrow of evolution. We may as well claim that the rejection of any one of the many theories of the atonement is the rejection of the fact of the atonement. What is has arrived by a gradual process controlled by the life energies functioning within and modified by the environment without. The changes in the physical as well as in the social order have come about through the operation of the silent, ever-working forces within and without.

Those who believed in God trembled for the ark and so tried to deny the reality of the new view of life. Scripture was quoted now as it was quoted against Galileo and Copernicus. As one reads the humiliating history of the conflict one is again reminded of the words of Maeterlinck, "At every crossing in the road that leads to the future, each progressive spirit is opposed by a thousand men appointed to guard the past." The new view has permeated every department of life. Nothing has escaped. The minister cannot evade. He must find a new foundation for his mental interpretations. He can no more escape the new view of life than the men of the six-

teenth and seventeenth centuries could live without reckoning with the new astronomy.

But no man can remain neutral. There is an atmosphere that is new and different from any that has ever been known to man. The point of view is different. The minister who lives at all must adjust himself to the new world that has come upon him in many cases as a disturbing and a distracting fact. He may curse the day of its birth, he may think that the new environment is a result of malicious infidelity. But indifferent or neutral he cannot remain. He might find help in reviewing the past for the sake of the wisdom needed in such an age as this.

We have reviewed the centuries. We see that nothing has remained fixed. The only thing that we see throughout the process is change and the consequent demand on men of thought and men of action to take some attitude toward the changes that have broken into the peace and rest of society. Men have given their strength to oppose the new ideas and have persecuted the pioneers, but new ideas have grown the more rapidly when they have been watered by the blood of those who have responded. We see, too, how the opponents have in the main become followers of those whom their fathers denounced. We are not critical. We are simply describing what is so clear to all who look back for light upon the day in which we must live, think, and work.

## II. The Underlying Philosophy

What satisfactory explanation can we give that may help us to be not only reconciled to but even friendly toward this persistent change which our backward glance has reemphasized? That change is responsible for the need of readjustments. We are absolutely compelled to accept the world as either static or as fluid—as finished and complete, or as dynamic and growing. It will not do to accept the static attitude for one department of life, say the moral and religious,

and the dynamic for the world of discovery and invention. Such a division would result in dividing God himself into two separate, unrelated parts. No sane, reverent, religious man would even in his extremity be ready to go as far as that. There can be no middle ground unless we reject monotheism and accept practical dualism.

We are thinking about human life, not in its biological, but in its intellectual and religious aspects. We confine ourselves in other words to human history, especially the part recorded in the Bible and in the history of the Christian church. As we have looked back over the ages we are compelled to accept the fact of change. The Hebrew life and religion were changing with the ages through which they passed; the Christian religion has changed with the centuries. It changed even during the period covered by the book of Acts.

The cause of the changes in human history must be found below its surface. There must be something in man himself—in life itself—that makes change inevitable and even necessary. Bergson speaks of the "original impetus of life," and

> all the living hold together and all yield to the same tremendous push. The animal takes its stand on the plant, man bestrides animality, and the whole of humanity, in space and in time, is one immense army galloping beside and before and behind each of us in an overwhelming charge able to beat down every resistance and clear the most formidable obstacles, perhaps even death.

One of the old Greeks reminded his generation that all was fluid and in motion—that no man can bathe in the same stream twice. His pupil later said that no man can bathe in the same stream once. The stream does not stop long enough for the man to finish his bath. Life is a race-course on which men are not looking back but forward. They may rejoice over it, or they may be sad over it, but look forward, or at least move forward, they must. Vain is the attempt to stand still.

The greatest teacher the world ever had said, " My Father worketh till now and I work." Many of his hearers thought that God had completed his job long ago. Change after change has taken place because God has lived and spoken throughout the ages. The Spirit was with Peter on Pentecost. The Spirit spoke to the great apostle later, and Peter thought, and Peter readjusted himself and accepted a broader view of the gospel.

The Holy Spirit has never played false with those who have followed. The church has been divided again and again during the centuries. Some have lived to maintain the faith once delivered; others have lived in the faith delivered like the manna daily by the life-giving presence of the Spirit of God in Christ. Christ is the author, the initiator, he is also the perfecter of our faith. There is a faith for the immature, there is a faith for the mature church. Many a mother's heart trembles when she sees her darling of a few years pass out into the larger school of life on its first entrance into the public school. She would in her ignorance keep it in the state of childhood. But there is a force which she cannot control. It is the force of life itself that is guiding that child into maturity. Keepers of the truth at times forget that we are not after all the keepers of the truth, or of life. Life is supreme. It breaks through the forms it has created and we are afraid. We try to stop change in our ignorance when we should rejoice that there is a power in the heart of history and in the heart of the church that is dynamic unto the overthrowing of all static structures. He who works with the life within and with the Spirit of Christ works with God.

### III. The Methods of Readjustment

We have now arrived at the point where we may wisely say something about methods of readjustment. There are two fundamental methods. The one is the method of fulfilment, and the other is the method of violence.

1. We shall take the last first, namely, that of *violence*. Sir Robert Peel, speaking on public opinion, March 23, 1820, said:

> It is growing too large for the channels that it has been accustomed to run through. God knows it is very difficult to widen them exactly in proportion to the size and force of the current which they have to convey, but the engineers that made them never dreamt of various streams that are now struggling for a vent.

Jesus warned his followers regarding the inevitableness of the violent method unless certain readjustments were made. The new wine-skin would mean a change without revolution; the preserving of the old wine-skin would mean change by revolution and loss of valuable contents. The violence of the French Revolution was due to the folly of the social engineers who did not realize the force of the new currents that had been flowing into the narrow, rigid, unelastic, petrified channels through which the life of the age was forced. These should have been widened in proportion to the demands of the new age. The violence that has characterized Russia is but a consequence of the autocratic, reactionary policy of the Romanofs. Repression means revolution.

Violent, catastrophic changes in the religious history of men have been due often to a false idea of loyalty to the past. Men are loyal to the past when they imitate the men of the past in their progressive forward movement. Jesus criticized the men of his day not because they built tombs to the prophets, but because they violently oppressed those who had the spirit of the prophets. Loyalty to the past compels us to improve on the past. The past gives us our talents. The reactionary takes his talent and keeps it—the faith once delivered—defends it, preserves it intact, thinking that that is enough. The man who appreciates what loyalty to the past means, receives the talent and invests it wisely that that talent may make another talent for the use of the Master. Men are inheritors and pioneers. Refusal to recognize this fact sooner

or later will produce change, but it will be a break, an explosion, a catastrophe, a bursting of wine-skins resulting in loss that might have been prevented.

2. Then there is readjustment by *fulfilment*. Bergson says that religious leaders should not forget "nature has had no more trouble in making an eye than I have in lifting my hand." There is no straining, no groaning about the regular, normal methods of nature. She does things so easily. When Paul was a child he reasoned as a child, but when he became a man he put away childish thoughts and view-points. Did he readjust gradually or by a violent catastrophic method? We all know the answer. We readjust as we grow and by growth.

The new is the fulfilment of all that has gone before. Progress becomes the conserver of the good that was in the old. Where there is no conservatism, there can be no progress. Professor E. A. Freeman in his Preface to his famous little volume on the English Constitution, says:

> Our ancient history is the possession of the Liberal, who, as being ever ready to reform, is the true Conservative, not of the self-styled Conservative, who, by refusing to reform, does all he can to bring on destruction.

The real conserver is the open-minded who is ever ready to readjust the forms of thought and life and even the contents, to the Spirit that is leading each age a little bit forward. The leader, the thinker, the teacher must not live apart from his times. To be ahead of one's day in the sense of being out of touch with it and unsympathetic with its currents is not a compliment to any man. Jesus was not ahead of his day in that sense. He wept over his Jerusalem; he did not scorn it. He mingled with the people even in their crude, mechanical worship. He was a real teacher of men. Too many so-called liberals and progressives have done irreparable harm to real constructive, progressive thought and life by the spirit shown toward those who have not been able to keep step with them. The minister is a teacher. He must recognize that the human

mind is trained gradually. It must first be "spoon fed with truth." There are men who believe in evolution as a theory, but do not practise it as a method of life—of ordinary, every-day life. When it comes to teaching new truths they accept the methods of the catastrophic revolutionaries. Thus real progress is hindered. The minister must give himself time in making the changes, and he must be patient with those who must make those changes necessarily more slowly than he can. He must give his own mind time, for no true change is sudden. The process is slow. He must be patient in the search for the evidences that corroborate the truth of any hypothesis. He should sit at the feet of great scientists and watch their methods and their patience. Above all he should "list to nature's teachings." What a lesson in patience geology will give him! How patient he will become with himself and especially with others. He will read the words of the ancient prophet with a new sense of their meaning, "He that believeth shall not make haste."

This method of readjustment is not, however, compromise. It is the method of the one who is acquainted with the life-processes in nature and in human nature. These processes are slow—but they are sure. There is no withstanding them. They are life-processes, and are therefore victorious over all that is trying to block their progress.

There must be strength and vigor in our thought today. Christianity in the first century entered into a world that was weak and weary in its religious and moral life. It was looking for consolation. The world today is strong and self-confident. The leadership that can fit Christianity into our life must be more than a protest, more than a slave, it must put on the strength of independent men who are not afraid of the world that lies round about. It must glory in capturing those forces for Christ. What a challenge this fact is to the minister personally and as a leader of a force! No pessimistic spirit can grip the world. There must be a forward, not a backward

look—a firm belief in the God who has been in all the changes of the past, who is in all the changes of the present, and who will never leave nor forsake those who will walk in the light and use that light for the teaching of men to become more at home in God's own world. We need courage, we need caution, we need charity, we need fairness, we need love in an age like this—

> an age on ages telling;
> To be living is sublime.

# AN ORTHODOX HERETIC OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

Professor ALBERT H. NEWMAN, Mercer University
Macon, Georgia

BEFORE the end of the fourth century the theologians of the East, after nearly a hundred years of controversy, had settled, or thought they had settled, the question, whether in the incarnate Christ the human nature united with deity was complete or partial, in favor of completeness. The Antiochian theologians from the third century onward had laid chief stress on the humanity of Christ. Paul of Samosata, some time bishop of Antioch and counselor of Queen Zenobia, was driven from his see because of his contention that Christ was only human (howbeit of perfect humanity) until his baptism, when he was adopted as Son of God and received divine attributes. While his successors repudiated his adoptionism they were all, like him, under the influence of the Aristotelian philosophy and were out-and-out anti-Platonists. Antagonism between the Platonizing school of Alexandria and the Aristotelizing school of Antioch was one of the leading features of doctrinal development during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. Aristotelianism was common sense, matter of fact, logical, unemotional, insistent upon clearness of statement and comprehensibility. Platonism was speculative, transcendental, mystical, with a decided tendency toward pantheism, and was not at all content with statements that the mind of man could fathom even when spiritually illuminated in the highest degree. The Antiochian school insisted that the Scriptures must be interpreted according to the natural meaning of the language and in view of the historical circumstances under which they were written. The Alexandrians, following in the footsteps of the great Jewish philosopher and theosophist Philo, developed, under the leadership of Origen, the allegorical method of inter-

pretation whereby all difficulties could be explained away and the most spiritual truth could be extracted from the least promising passages. It was the great Origen who first undertook to defend the Son of God against Ebionites and Gnostics, who denied his perfect deity and eternity, by putting forth the theory of the eternal sonship. He insisted that the generative process was an eternal process, sonship being as essential to fatherhood as fatherhood is essential to sonship. As God is unchangeable and could not from being a non-father become a father, the Son must be coeternal with the Father.

Arius, an Alexandrian, after spending some time among the Antiochians and imbibing something of the Aristotelian temper of his teachers, returned to Antioch and early in the fourth century began to make light of the transcendental theologizing of his associates. Either there were three coeternal, consubstantial, and coequal Gods (which seemed to him tritheistic and absurd), or "there was when the Son was not," that is to say, the Son cannot be regarded as coeternal with the Father, and if not coeternal he was certainly not coequal or even consubstantial. On the other hand, he must be regarded as a creature of the Father, yet the first and most exalted product of God's creative activity. Through him the universe was created and is administered, all divine light and truth have been communicated to mankind, and to him (under God) all power in heaven and on earth have been given. He became incarnate in Christ (humanity being represented only by the body), and suffered in the flesh for man's redemption.

The Alexandrian theologians, represented by the bishop Alexander and Athanasius, who soon gained recognition as the champion of Alexandrian orthodoxy, in repelling the attacks of Arius upon Origen's eternal generation theory soon went beyond Origen, who had so far subordinated the Son to the Father as to make the eternal generative process to depend upon the will of the Father, by maintaining that the generative process belongs to the very nature of the Godhead,

thus eliminating every vestige of subordination. Thus the Alexandrian school came to lay the utmost stress upon the absolute deity of Christ, involving the completeness and the finality of his revelation. The difficulties encountered by the Alexandrians in explaining many passages in the New Testament that seem to involve limitation and subordination in the incarnate Word, were somewhat docetically explained as an accommodation to the human understanding.

With a view to bridging the chasm between Arianism and Athanasianism Apollinarius of Laodicæa advanced the theory that in the incarnate Christ body and soul (including intellect, emotions, and will) were human, derived from Mary, while the Logos (Word) took the place of the human spirit, the Logos-spirit controlling the human body and soul, from which all sinfulness was from conception onward absolutely excluded. This view proved unacceptable not only to the Alexandrian theologians, but also to the great Cappadocians (Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa) and to such Antiochian theologians as Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Without following up the discussion in further detail, it may be confidently asserted that by the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy (A. D. 428) all of the theologians whose opinions mattered (Arians of course excepted) agreed in insisting that in the incarnation perfect deity united with complete humanity. The question at issue between the Antiochian and the Alexandrian schools, which centuries of the most bitter and pervasive controversy could only partially settle, was from this time onward, whether after the union the humanity retained its integrity under the control of the deity, or was the finite humanity so blended with or absorbed by the infinite deity that it could no longer be distinguished from it and thus came to possess all divine attributes, including omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence.

Nestorius, a learned and deeply pious monk of Antioch,

a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus, already distinguished for his pulpit eloquence and his literary skill, was in 428 appointed Patriarch of Constantinople and imperial court preacher. He seems to have had little knowledge of the world or of the movements of religious thought and life outside his own native Syria. Constantinople, the new capital of the Roman Empire, had not yet developed a distinct local type of theology or monasticism. Monks of the Egyptian type, with strong monophysite tendencies and fiercely antagonistic to Antiochian modes of thought, were there in large numbers, had the sympathy and support of the masses, and in general dominated the situation. There had long been a pronounced rivalry between Alexandria and Antioch in the matter of securing the patriarchal office, the only other important rival being the Cappadocian school. During this period the most eminent pulpit or orators were furnished by Antioch (as John Chrysostom and Nestorius) and the Cappadocian region (as Gregory Nazianzen). In appointing Nestorius as patriarch the emperor had ignored the claims of local clergy, who on this account were not sympathetic with Nestorius.

Soon after he entered upon his ministry in Constantinople, Nestorius was greatly shocked by hearing the term "Mother of God" (*theotokos*) applied to the mother of Christ. The use of this term seemed to him to involve the virtual deification of Mary, who was indeed already being worshiped as a divine personage by the monks and the ignorant masses. As a matter of fact, the exaltation of the humanity of Christ to absolute deity or (which amounts to the same thing) its absorption into the infinite God, left the people without a truly human Saviour, touched with a feeling of our infirmities, and readily approachable in prayer, and there was no doubt a profound sense of the need of a gentle, tender-hearted personage endued with divine power and grace and readily approachable by the devout soul in need of sympathy and comfort. This is true today as well as in the fifth century, and if the current

conception of Christ in any age or place virtually eliminates the humanity from the deity, Christ ceases to satisfy the longing soul, and a human mediator is sure to be sought. What more natural than that the mother of Christ should be thought capable of supplying the need? If she is the mother of Him who from the moment of his conception became absolutely divine, why should she not be called the Mother of God and be worshiped as a woman exalted by this relationship to the utmost divine favor and able as well as willing to receive the adoration and to hear the prayers of the devout believer? No doubt the people just emerging from paganism with its worship of female deities were very ready to pay divine honor to her whom the theologians declared to be the mother of the Redeemer. Not being worldly-wise and so not fully appreciating the zeal of the Constantinopolitan monks and populace for the glorification of the Virgin Mary, the good patriarch gave free expression in a series of sermons to his disapproval of the use of the expression Mother of God with the idolatry implied by the term. As might have been expected Nestorius' denunciation of Mariolatry raised a storm of protest. The monks of Constantinople lost no time in reporting Nestorius' words and actions to Cyril, the brilliant Patriarch of Alexandria who was all too eager to lay hold upon anything that he could use against the Antiochian Nestorius. Cyril straightway set all the wires to work to destroy confidence in his brother patriarch and to compass his ruin. Cyril was one of the most ambitious and one of the most unscrupulous men of his age, and if he did not adopt the maxim that the end justifies the means, he certainly acted on the principle involved. It was he who encouraged the fierce monks of the desert to come to Alexandria and to murder the gentle and gifted Hypatia for preaching Neo-Platonic doctrine in the city that he claimed as of divine right to rule in religious matters. (Kingsley's "Hypatia," based on facts, can hardly be said to represent Cyril in too odious a light.) It must be admitted

that Nestorius, while high-principled and moderate in comparison with Cyril and upon the whole conciliatory in his bearing, was himself far from being a model of tolerance or an advocate of liberty of conscience. In fact, he is said to have been responsible for the destruction of an Arian meeting-house in Constantinople and to have inspired an imperial edict against Novatians and other sects. I think Nestorius would have freely admitted that if he had really been the promulgator of unsound doctrine, as Cyril maintained that he was, his banishment would have been wholly justifiable. So, we cannot find fault with Cyril for his zeal against heresy, but for the underhand means, including political intrigue, packed councils, misrepresentation, the incitement of fanatical monks and populace, by which he sought to drive Nestorius from his office and to end his career by banishment to the desert.

But we must define more carefully the points at issue between Nestorius, the representative of the Antiochian school, and Cyril, the representative of the Alexandrian. It may be premised, that when he found he had given serious offense Nestorius attempted to conciliate adverse opinion by allowing that the expression Mother of God might be used in the sense that Mary was the mother of the humanity that was associated with deity in the person of Christ. He expressed a preference for the designation "Mother of Christ." In a sermon delivered about Christmas, A. D. 428, and in several sermons of a somewhat later date, some of the expressions that gave most offense, along with his objection to the term *theotokos,* were: "Mary did not bring forth Deity but man, the instrument of Deity"; "The creature did not bring forth the uncreatable." And yet he sought to guard against the possible inference that in Christ there are two Sons, a divine and a human.

> We have not two Christs or two Sons; for there is not with us a first and a second, or one and another, but the same one is twofold, not in honor, but in nature.

Again he sought in the following expression to justify the unification of our reverence for the divine-human Christ:

> We confess the God in man, we reverence the man worshiped together with Almighty God through the divine union.

Nestorius did not fall behind any of his contemporaries in his exaltation of the Divine Logos (Word) as of the nature of the Father, as the Creator and Maker of all things, yea, of the blessed Mary herself. He is as eternal as the Father. He is indestructible and unchangeable. He is the only begotten Son of the Father. His essence is the Divine Essence. But he could not believe that in the incarnation the perfect humanity of Christ became identified with the Divine Logos in such a way as to lose its human properties or attributes and to become possessed of all divine attributes. He was no doubt extremely anxious to harmonize his views with those of his Constantinopolitan brethren and tried by a multitude of statements and distinctions to reconcile them to his views; but the majority of his constituents were under the influence of the Alexandrian transcendentalism, which was radically opposed to the Antiochian Christology.

We cannot give the details of the proceedings of Cyril of Alexandria against Nestorius. He wrote to the heads of the monastic institutions of Egypt, Asia Minor, Constantinople, etc., in such a way as alarm them as sticklers for orthodoxy and to arouse to fury their persecuting zeal. An arch-heretic was proclaiming his venomous heresy in the imperial church and was dishonoring the blessed Virgin Mother of God. He must by all possible means be dethroned and discredited. He wrote to the Emperor, to the Empress, and to Pulcheria, the Emperor's brilliant and unscrupulous sister, expressing in strong language his disapproval of the heretical patriarch and court preacher. He entered into correspondence with Nestorius himself, ostensibly with the hope of winning him to orthodoxy and saving him from impending ruin, but in reality

(if we may judge from the malignity of his later proceedings) to draw from him further expressions of heterodox opinions that he could use against him. Realizing the importance of winning the bishop of Rome to the support of his crusade against Nestorius, Cyril composed for his perusal five books, "Against the Blasphemies of Nestorius." Nestorius had sent to Bishop Celestine of Rome copies of the sermons that had aroused so much opposition. Celestine was not theologian enough to appreciate the fine distinctions involved in the great Christological controversy; but Nestorius had recently treated with kindly consideration some Pelagian leaders who had been condemned for heresy in the West, and Celestine was easily persuaded that he was a dangerous heretic, at one time (as he believed) making Christ a mere man and at another attributing to him participation in divinity. So he called a synod for the excommunication of the heretical patriarch, unless he should recant within ten days after receiving the decree; and the clergy of Constantinople, the patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, and the bishops of Macedonia were at the same time instructed to withdraw fellowship from Nestorius unless he should recant in the prescribed time. Cyril was commissioned to pronounce the anathema on behalf of the Roman bishop. To give due dignity and authority to his proceedings Cyril called a synod to ratify the condemnation of Nestorius and promptly communicated to Nestorius the action of the synod. Cyril's officiousness had given offense to the imperial court, which still remained loyal to Nestorius and resented outside interference. The Emperor Theodosius, probably acting on the advice of Nestorius, proceeded to call a General Synod to assemble at Ephesus in the spring of 431. No doubt the emperor and his patriarch expected that such a council, held within easy reach of Antioch, would vindicate Nestorius and censure Cyril.

Cyril had attached to his synodical letter twelve anathemas in which he sought to condemn every phase of Antiochian

Christology and to express in the most unmistakable manner his monophysite views. It will be necessary to cite most of these in order that we may have clearly before us the points at issue. He declares:

> Immanuel [i. e., God with us, the incarnate Logos] is very God, and consequently the Holy Virgin is the Mother of God, for she brought forth carnally the incarnate Logos. The Logos [Word] from God the Father is in the flesh one in essence and evidently at the same time God and man. Hence after the union the natures in the one Christ are not to be distinguished, nor is it to be said that they are merely joined together in dignity or power. Rather they have come together according to natural [physical] unity.

He anathematizes those who would distinguish in the Gospels the words and acts of Christ that were thought to belong to the deity from those thought suitable to the humanity, who called Christ a God-bearing man, who called God the Father the God or Master of Christ, who said that Jesus as a man was energized by the Logos and received dignity from him, who spoke of the humanity of Christ as having been assumed by the Logos and worthy of worship and glorification because of the assumption, who speak of the Lord Jesus Christ as glorified by the Spirit. On the other hand, he asserted that the Holy Spirit is his very own and is used by him. The Word of God actually became flesh, and the flesh of the Lord is life-giving, as being an integral part of the Word of God himself. God the Word suffered in the flesh, was crucified in the flesh, tasted death in the flesh. Cyril's favorite scripture was "The Word became flesh."

Nestorius, confident at the time of imperial support, had replied to Cyril's twelve anathemas with twelve definitions almost equally dogmatic and uncompromising. When the Synod had been called John, Patriarch of Antioch, whom Nestorius had reason to regard as his friend and whose views might be supposed to be essentially identical with his own, advised him to admit the qualified use of the expression Mother

of God and to assume as conciliatory an attitude as possible. Bishop Memnon of Ephesus was known to be a henchman of Cyril, and his influence throughout Asia Minor was known to be very considerable. Cyril spent the time between the calling of the Synod and the date of its assembling in arranging for the largest possible attendance of his supporters and for their early arrival at Ephesus. He saw to it that a large number of fiercely fanatical monks, who would be able and ready, in case of emergency, to lay violent hands upon his opponents and prevent their scoring a victory, were in attendance. John of Antioch and the Syrian clergy were delayed by famine and bad weather. The representatives of the Bishop of Rome also failed to arrive on time. At the appointed time Cyril was present with a great body of Alexandrian and Egyptian clergy and monks, many of Nestorius' opponents from Constantinople and its vicinity, and a great body of Memnon's supporters from his diocese. He decided to take matters into his own hands and to secure the condemnation of Nestorius in an *ex-parte* gathering rather than risk the result of a free discussion by the entire constituency. Nestorius refused to sit in this body or to recognize its jurisdiction.

When John of Antioch and his clergy arrived they refused to sit in council with Cyril and his party, repudiated their proceedings against Nestorius, and excommunicated Cyril and Memnon. Cyril was well aware that he had incurred the imperial disfavor; yet something must be done to save the situation. The Emperor had prohibited either party in the controversy from visiting Constantinople. Cyril sent a messenger in the disguise of a beggar to Dalmatius, an aged and highly influential monk and a bitter enemy of Nestorius, with instructions to arrange a great public demonstration against the patriarch. Dalmatius summoned the monks to join in a great torchlight procession to the imperial palace, secured an interview with the Emperor, and convinced him that he had made a mistake in protecting Nestorius and censuring Cyril.

Cyril's partisans were now freely admitted to the city and court. The sentiment against Nestorius soon became too strong to allow his continuing in office, and he was permitted to retire to a monastery. Yet Cyril was still under censure as the author of the church troubles. He sought now to make peace with the patriarch of Antioch. Cyril agreed to allow the use of the term "Mother of God" in a limited sense (such as even Nestorius could accept), while John acquiesced in the banishment of Nestorius and the appointment of a partisan of Cyril as his successor. The desertion of Nestorius by John, who must have agreed with him perfectly in doctrine, was a most reprehensible act.

The banishment of the great, devout, and thoroughly orthodox preacher to an oasis in the Egyptian desert, so far from ending the controversy, added fuel to the flames. Theodoret of Cyrus, the great exegete and church historian, took up the controversy on the Antiochian or dyophysite side, while Eutyches, of Constantinople, went considerably beyond Cyril (who died in 444) in his monophysite dogmatism, while Dioscurus, his successor in the patriarchate of Alexandria, was if possible even more intolerant and unscrupulous. Eutyches denied that the body of Christ was the same in essence as our bodies and asserted that the humanity of Christ is to the deity as a drop of honey to the ocean. Flavian, an Antiochian, became patriarch of Constantinople, and being sore pressed by the Eutycheans appealed to Leo of Rome for support. Leo wrote a letter in which the Antiochian position was taken throughout, the only distinctive feature being his insistence on two persistently complete natures in one person. A General Synod was called by the Emperor (449) for the settlement of the controversy which had again reached a very acute stage. Dioscurus got control of the Synod as Cyril had done eighteen years before. He treated with contempt the doctrinal epistle of Leo at Rome, and Flavian and his supporters were mobbed by the monks that Dioscurus had doubt-

less brought there for the purpose. Emperor and Pope now joined forces in calling the Council of Chalcedon (451), which condemned Dioscurus as a heretic and murderer, adopted Leo's letter and the writings of several Antiochian theologians as standards of orthodoxy and formulated a short creed wholly in accord with Nestorius's views. If Emperor and Pope entertained the hope that the Council would put an end to the strife they were sorely disappointed. But it is not my purpose to go beyond the death of Nestorius which occurred shortly before or shortly after the Council of Chalcedon, at any rate after he had learned that his views had gained the support of the Roman See and of the imperial government.

Thus far we might have gone before the discovery a few years ago at Kotschanes, the seat of the Nestorian patriarch in Persia, of the manuscript of a Syriac translation of an *Apologia pro sua Vita* written by Nestorius in Greek shortly before his death. A copy of this most interesting and instructive work was taken to England, and J. F. Bethune-Baker in his little volume entitled, "Nestorius and his Teaching, a Fresh Examination of the Evidence, with special Reference to the newly discovered Apology of Nestorius (The Bazaar of Heraclides)," Cambridge, 1908, presented to the English reader a learned and luminous account of the Nestorian controversy with careful translations of the pertinent portions of the Syriac manuscript. Bethune-Baker was unfortunate in rendering the first word in the title "Bazaar." German and French scholars are unanimous in preferring "Book," a more literal rendering would seem to be "Transactions" or "Proceedings." The reason for publishing his Apology pseudonomously is supposed to have been that, being a condemned heretic, he feared that with his own name the book would be suppressed or destroyed and would fail of its purpose. In 1910 R. P. Bedjan, whose name would suggest his Oriental origin, published in Paris the Syriac text of Nestorius's Apology, and F. Nau in cooperation with Bedjan and Briere published

a French translation of the Book of Heraclides together with the Greek text of three Homilies of Nestorius on the Temptations of our Lord and three Appendixes. Dr. F. Loofs, who in 1905 had published a large volume of Nestorian documents, practically exhaustive of materials available at the time, has given close and expert attention to the newly discovered materials in the supplementary volumes of the Hauck-Herzog encyclopædia and in a small English volume. Fendt, a liberal Catholic scholar of Strassburg, used the new materials in a very judicious way in his "The Christology of Nestorius," 1910. A number of Armenian documents of no great importance have also been made available to the student in the last few years.

Let us see what the good exile has to say for himself. We must bear in mind that he was at the time of his trial confronted with extreme formulations of monophysite doctrine and was compelled either to acquiesce in Cyril's dogmas with their anathemas, or in a clear and definite way to combat monophysitism and vindicate the persistent completeness of Christ's humanity. Cyril and his associates put the most unfavorable construction, from their point of view, on whatever he said or wrote, and would have it that his language implied, if it did not directly assert, that Christ had two personalities, a divine and a human, or in other terms that there were virtually two Christs closely associated with each other, the human receiving honor and glory from the divine without actually participating therein. When Nestorius was deposed and banished, his Persian adherents, who were numerous and who held to the dyophysite doctrine in its most extreme form, abominating monophysitism of the Cyrilian type and Cyril's persecuting spirit, seceded from the Eastern Catholic church and with independent organization carried on a great and successful missionary work in India, China, and other Oriental regions, which has persisted to the present time. The Nestorians refused to be reconciled with the Eastern Church even

when the Council of Chalcedon accepted Nestorius's doctrines almost in toto.

Hear Nestorius's bitter complaint of Cyril's intolerant attitude at the Synod of Ephesus in 431:

> Was it the synod and the emperor who summoned it that heard my cause, if he [Cyril] was ranked among the judges? But why should I say "ranked among the judges?" He was the whole tribunal, for everything that he said was at once said by all of them as well, and they unhesitatingly agreed with him as the personification of the court. Now if all the judges were assembled and the accusers were set in their ranks, and the accused also in like manner, all should have had equal liberty of speech. But if he [Cyril] was everything—accuser and emperor and judge—then he did everything, ousting from this authority him who was appointed by the emperor and setting himself in his place, and assembling to himself those whom he wanted, from both far and near, and making himself the court. And so I was summoned by Cyril, who assembled the synod, and by Cyril who was its head. Who is judge? Cyril. And who is accuser? Cyril. Who the bishop of Rome? Cyril. Cyril was everything.

After giving further emphasis to the fact that Cyril had equipped himself with, or at least assumed, full imperial and papal authority and had packed the synod with his henchmen, he refers to Memnon's assembling the "rabble of idlers and rustics" who armed with clubs paraded the streets shouting and yelling against himself and his friends, burning their writings and threatening their lives.

> Who could refrain from weeping [he continues] when he remembers the wrongs done at Ephesus! And would God it were against me and against my life they were done, and not in a wrong cause! For then I should have no need of these words on behalf of one who was meet to be punished; but on behalf of our Saviour Jesus Christ, the just Judge, for whose sake I have undertaken to endure patiently, that the whole body of Christ may not be accused.

Nestorius was as much concerned to avoid Arian curtailment of the humanity of Christ to the mere body and Apollinarian curtailment to body and soul, as he was to guard

against the Cyrilian theory of the absorption of the finite humanity by the infinite deity. The following statement from the "Book of Heraclides" will enable us more fully to enter into sympathy with his mode of thought:

> We were discussing whether it was right to understand and to say that the proper things of the flesh and of the rational soul, and the proper things of God the Word, both belong to God the Word by nature; or whether we should say of Christ that the two natures were united in him in a union of one person. And I was saying and maintaining that the union was of the one person of Christ. And I was showing that God the Word certainly became man, and that Christ is God the Word and at the same time man, inasmuch as he became man. And for this reason it was that the Fathers [Nicene] when teaching us who Christ is, about whom there was a dissension [Arian controversy] first laid down those things of which Christ consists. But thou [Cyril] because thou wishest that the person of the union should be God the Word in both natures, dost neglect these things as superfluous, and dost neglect to make a beginning from them.

He means to charge Cyril with contradicting the teaching of the Nicene Fathers in his contention that after the union of the humanity is no longer distinguishable, but that Christ is God the Word in whom there is no distinction between humanity and deity but all is absolutely divine.

A remark made by Nestorius in a private discussion with Theodotus and Acacius at Ephesus was resented by his opponents more deeply than anything he said or did, save perhaps his rather harshly expressed disapproval of the term *theotokos*. Referring to the infant Jesus he was reported to have said that he "would not call a two-or-three-months old babe God." In the Syriac Apology he seeks, perhaps not very successfully, to correct the invidious report of his opponents, by maintaining that he said or meant to say, not that he could not bring himself to call a babe God, but that he objected to calling God a babe.

In his discussion with Acacius Nestorius thought his opponent

had fallen into two errors: For first he perversely asked a question which perversely laid upon those who were to answer it the necessity of either denying altogether that the Godhead of the Only-begotten became man, or professing—what is impious—that the Godhead of the Father and the Holy Spirit also became incarnate with the Word.

Nestorius undoubtedly at the time of the trial and before had used such expressions as that Christ was recently born, that Christ has come to be and was not from eternity, that the Logos put on human nature as a garment, had taken up his abode in the human body as in a temple, received or assumed human nature, that the divine Logos used the humanity as an instrument. Yet he always laid stress upon the expression "one Christ."

A few more quotations from the Book of Heraclides may aid us in understanding how Nestorius understood the relation of the divine and the human in Christ in his old age and how he believed at that time that he had taught at the time of his controversy with Cyril.

The Nature [*ousia*] of deity is kept intact and without suffering in the nature [*ousia*] of the flesh, and the flesh abides also in the nature [*ousia*] of the flesh while it is in the nature and person of Deity.

Again:

when I mention "God the Word," this is in regard of nature, but when I speak of him as "Son," this is in regard of person; but he is one and the same God the Word.

Again:

It is by person that he [the Son] is distinguished (from the Father). But it is not so in regard to the union of the Godhead and the manhood. He is not by the union in all those things that the person by its nature is, so that in the one person he should become another being [*ousia*].

The following is significant:

For he [Christ] took man's person, not the *ousia* or the nature, so that it should be either of the same essence [*omoousios*] with the Father or else another son altogether and not the same.

Again, "Nor is there any addition to the person [of the Logos] when he takes man to his own person." This sentence well expresses Nestorius's view of the incarnation:

> God the Word, who is said to have become flesh and the Son of man, is recognized through the form and person of the flesh and of the man, which [form and person] he employed that he might make himself known to the world.

He speaks also of

> a union into his own person of that also in which he became man. . . They [the divine and human natures] have moreover a mutual will, since the person of this is the person of that and the person of that the person of this.

It is the conviction of Loofs, Bethune-Baker, and most of the scholars who have given attention to the new materials on Nestorius, that Nestorius was no Nestorian and that his reputation for orthodoxy has been fully vindicated; that he was really a martyr for the principles for which the Antiochian School had long contended, at the hands of the Alexandrian monophysites who through chicanery and cruelty temporarily gained the upper hand; and that his teachings were in substantial accord with those of the Council of Chalcedon in which the Eastern and Western Catholic churches united in condemning Dioscurus, the monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, in which the writings of the leading Antiochian theologians (Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Persia) along with the letter of Leo the Great of Rome, were accepted as authoritative expositions of the doctrine of the person of Christ, and which adopted the symbol of Chalcedon, long regarded as authoritative in East and West alike.

The aged exile learned of the deposition of Dioscurus, the letter of Leo, and probably of the action of the Council of Chalcedon (451), before he put forth his apology. That he should have rejoiced beyond measure in the triumph of his

principles and the virtual vindication of himself is what might have been expected. He was too near his end to have any hope of resuming his work among his own people, and the Council had failed to free him from the charge of heresy. He would leave behind him this Apology in the hope that posterity would do him justice. The closing words, which I quote from Bethune-Baker's translation are in the highest degree pathetic and give us a fine insight into the purity and nobility of his character:

> As for me, I have borne the sufferings of my life and all that has befallen me in this world as the suffering of a single day; and I have not changed, lo, all these years. And now, lo, I am already on the point to depart, and daily I pray to God to dismiss me—me, whose eyes have seen his salvation. Rejoice with me, O Desert, thou my friend and mine upbringer and my place of sojourning; and thou, Exile, my mother, who after my death shalt keep my body until the resurrection cometh in the time of God's good pleasure.

# EVOLVING CHRISTIAN IDEAS AND THE PROBLEM OF TERMS

Professor RALPH W. NELSON, Department of Philosophy
Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Missouri

## I

TRANSITION from Augustinian and medieval theology to that theology which, if Christianity is to continue, will intellectually justify it to those who live in the next era—this transition has no greater problem than the question of how ideas are to evolve when terms with outworn connotations persist in clinging to them. Terms are essential to the very life of ideas; no idea can live in human society unless it can find words that will actually convey its meaning from one mind to other minds; indeed many psychologists hold that an idea cannot live and grow, even in an individual mind, without verbal expression of itself to that mind. Certainly it must be admitted that for a *social* movement such as Christianity has been throughout its history, it is essential for the enlarging ideas by which we grow into a fuller appreciation and a clearer understanding of the truth that, by this advance in our own learning, continues to set us free—it is essential for these ideas to be *expressed* by Christians in both word and deed.

Here we strike the bed-rock of difficulty. To the Middle Ages and to Protestantism as well, God was an absolute Monarch who foreordained every good or evil that might come to men, or that might be done by men. We have outgrown this specific doctrine of foreordination, but there is scarcely a phase of Christianity where its implications are not still observable, some clinging even to the word "God." Indeed the roots of the monarchical conception are found in the Old Testament, and with it for his background and himself definitely attributing "the law, the prophets, and the psalms" to God, it is a real question how much autocracy is connoted in

Jesus' claim that "all *authority*" had been given unto him. Convinced as we are that the monarchical conception of God must go, we then face the question of how much of that which has come down to us as historic Christianity must go with it.

Can we agree with Harnack as to the *extent* of the change wrought in Christianity by Neo-Platonic theologians, and reject their *doctrinization* (or intellectual justification according to their logic of their time) of Christianity, meanwhile retaining the predominantly practical *way of life,* which some scholars hold to have been Christianity as it was interpreted by the apostles and as we find it presented in the New Testament? Or, must we go back farther yet, and, guided by our own subjective criterion of what we think Jesus ought to be, draw a line across the pages of the New Testament itself between the portrayal of Jesus as a princely and commanding emissary of the King of heaven, and Jesus as the kind and patient Teacher and Revealer of the will and wisdom of a God who is the loving Father of all men? In short, do the pages of the New Testament that speak of the *kingdom* of God and the *authority* with which Jesus taught, portray him and God as autocrats; or is this meaning and connotation to be traced to the logic and the politics of the intervening centuries?

It is a question of how certain terms are to be taken; or more accurately, it is a question of the *particular device we adopt to enable our knowledge* of Christ's way and truth and life *to expand* sufficiently to meet the requirements of present-day religious transition, and at the same time to *find terms* that will *express these enlarged ideas to ourselves and our fellows.*

For instance, if we adopt the view that autocracy is to be found in the New Testament—that the New Testament is at least partly responsible for traditional theology's autocratic interpretation of God's relation to the world—we are obliged to hold the second sentence of the Lord's Prayer to be contradictory (using the term in the popular sense) to the first:

"*Our Father*" can have a *family,* but he cannot have a "*kingdom.*" Likewise, this view would compel us to hold either that the New Testament presents Jesus as an autocrat, or that it incorrectly attributes the claim of "*all authority*" to him.

Obviously, this is an extreme view, one that may easily lead us into greater difficulties than those it seeks to avoid. It tries to save Jesus from the stigma of autocracy by striking at the heart of the credibility of the New Testament, our only source for any conception of Christ that can pretend to be historical and not the creation of the ethical imaginations of men. Indeed the very antagonism of this view to historic Christian and New Testament terms—however laudable may be the aim to insert ethically enlarged ideas in place of antiquated connotations of the old terms—is calculated to cut its adherents off from those Christians who most need to learn the enlarged ideas. For ideas do not walk about in the world of men unclothed by human terms; they move from mind to mind only when minds meet on the common ground of terms that are understood in approximately the same sense; hence it is folly to begin the process of teaching new and larger ideas of Christianity to those who know them not, by challenging the terms and discrediting the sources that are inseparable from the only Christianity that they know.

In a word, an ascetic attitude toward terms that are ineradicably rooted both in the New Testament and in the thought of the Christian centuries—the attempt to flee from these terms by asserting that they cannot be the words that Jesus used, but must have been put into his mouth by the misguided zeal of New Testament writers—this verbal asceticism may not only accompany a high type of personal Christianity on the part of, but likewise be the only reasonable course for, that generation of Christian pioneers who have been the first to see the necessity and the possibility of achieving a higher conception of Christianity than the intellectual forms of medieval theology make possible. These pioneers, however,

can scarcely expect to achieve effective leadership over many of their fellow Christians because of the fact that leadership requires the meeting of minds, and minds do not meet unless terms are used that are familiar to followers as well as leaders and mean essentially the same to both; therefore this attitude of verbal asceticism can hope for even less influence on the basic life of the church than had its counterpart on the church of the Middle Ages. So we must devise a more efficient *means for expressing* the new-born ideas of present-day morally awakened Christianity, for these ideas, should they be expressed clearly, may lead the way to a rediscovery of Christ.

II

I have already mentioned another possible way out: We might test the theory that these objectionable connotations are traceable primarily to Greek and medieval intellectual and social conditions, and that they are not to be found in the New Testament according to any *necessary* interpretation. At first glance this theory will appear unworthy of consideration to many who are in reality best prepared to judge it. Certainly it can make no claim to conciseness of form or simplicity of application. It is far easier, when we confront a serious obstacle in our accustomed path of Christian progress, to turn back and look for a fork where we may have missed the true path than it is to make careful examination of the obstacle itself to see if it may be as formidable as it at first appeared. Dropping the figure, autocratic conceptions of God and Christ *may be* cleared away by a deeper insight and a truer interpretation than that which first found them in the New Testament; and this improved insight ought to be possible for us in view of the fact that we can utilize in our study fifteen centuries more of experience with Christianity than that which led Augustine to adopt the institutionalized theocracy of the Old Testament as the framework for his doctrinal presentation of what had been till then a comparatively unor-

ganized *Way of life*—a doctrinal interpretation which, we recall, soon led to the institutionalization of Christianity.

There is no occasion for surprise, then, in the fact that an autocratically organized church read the New Testament in the light of the only social experience from which it might acquire meanings to clothe the terms of its sacred records. For upwards of a thousand years Christians knew no form of society either in the church or outside of it that would suggest to them any other than autocratic meanings for every word in the Bible which these meanings might possibly fit. So the fact that, and the reason why, Christian leaders from Augustine to the dawn of the twentieth century should have understood the Bible to present an autocratic conception of God, are perfectly clear. The question for us is, *Was this interpretation correct?*

The easiest answer is to say that it was; and the simplest course for us to pursue is to follow this interpretation intellectually while rebelling against it emotionally: to say, Yes, the New Testament gives an autocratic presentation of Christianity and of God's relation to the world, for the memory of fifteen hundred years of Christianity runneth not to the contrary; but away with autocracy and away with these passages of the New Testament so far as we are concerned! That is the answer of the position that I have characterized as verbal asceticism, and it is obviously and superficially easy; I have already tried, all too briefly, to sketch a few of the difficulties that lie farther along its way. Now I shall attempt to outline the alternative theory, which has little to commend it superficially, but which may prove more workable in the end. For however commendable a theory may appear to be, if it does not prove to be workable, we may well have serious doubts as to its scientific value.

I have conceded that traditional theology's conception of God as an absolute Autocrat, who forcordains the weal or woe of every man, is so outworn and unethical as to be utterly

impossible of belief to the ordinary Christian of to-day. The theory of verbal asceticism asserts that traditional theology was unethical in some of its basic doctrines, but correct in its definitions and interpretations of the New Testament terms and passages from which it claimed to derive these doctrines; for this assumption of the correctness of traditional interpretations is involved in the judgment that the only way to avoid the unethical doctrines is to decline to accept these terms and passages as authentic. The theory I am suggesting would go a step farther, and assert that traditional theology is not only unethical in many of its doctrines of God and his relations to mankind, but that it is *likewise incorrect in the definitions of terms and interpretations of Scripture that are said to underlie these doctrines.* On this theory, therefore, the way to escape unethical conceptions of God, or of Christ's presentations of him, would not be so simple as the rejection of offensive terms and the New Testament passages in which they appear; but would involve the patient and laborious task of attempting to discover more ethical meanings in the very passages themselves, *meanings which may have been* in the mind of Jesus *instead of those* that Greek-inspired theology has throughout the centuries *thought it saw* in him. In brief, I suggest that it is within the limits of the possible that when theologians of eight and fifteen centuries ago did their best, in the light of human experience of their time, at the task of discerning *what Jesus meant* by the words their and our records attribute to him—I suggest the possibility that their best efforts at discerning meanings are utterly inadequate and highly erroneous in the light of our experience today; and that, guided by our larger experience, we ought to be able to reinterpret the New Testament and redefine its terms so as to get closer to the original thought of Jesus than was possible for Augustine, Aquinas, or Calvin. Whether or not we succeed would be determined by our success or failure in leading Christianity decisively on toward its next era.

III

Within the limits of this paper I can give but a few examples of terms redefined according to this theory. First, however, I must warn some readers against attempting to understand my reinterpretations, if it should be that they have already adopted a major premise that makes these reinterpretations impossible. There are modernists who, with varying degrees of awareness of the full significance of their thought, conceive God as *Nature* personified and spiritualized. God, to them, is simply Nature conceived as a purposeful and personal Spirit, a purely immanent conception, for such a God works among men only by natural means. Others see little ethical value and much logical confusion in this substitution of the term "God" for the term "nature," and prefer to conceive God as the Common Will of humanity. Both of these conceptions are naturalistic in the sense that they reject the conception of God as a preexistent Creator and supernatural Being.

I have no quarrel with either of these naturalistic conceptions, *provided* their advocates hold them *hypothetically rather than dogmatically;* and the test of whether or not these conceptions are held hypothetically will be their holders' attitude of open-mindedness toward the alternative *supernatural* conception of God involved in the theory I am here proposing. For the very *essence* of a scientific hypothesis is found in the fact that it is held *tentatively* (although with the *positive* faith requisite to a fair test of it) in view of a frankly recognized *possible alternative*.[1] The moment its holders lose sight of this alternative and consider their theory or conception to be the only possible answer to the question at issue, that theory *ceases to be a hypothesis* and *becomes a dogma,* a dogma that closes all avenues of thought by henceforth begging (posi-

[1] Compare R. W. Sellars, "The Essentials of Logic," p. 197; also Bosanquet, "Logic" (second edition), vol. II, chapter V, local citation, p. 151.

tively) every point in its own favor and begging (negatively) every point that may be raised against it.[2]

Therefore I gladly welcome all naturalistic conceptions of God as possible alternatives to my supernatural conception; for my conception of God as a preexistent Creator is, from the standpoint of logic, a *hypothesis* rather than a dogma. Indeed, I challenge all these conceptions to a test of their ability, as compared with that of the supernatural conception, to lead the world on to a greater, more ethical future; for this alone will serve to determine for us humans which conception of God is the true one.[3]

Indeed I have no word of condemnation for any one who dogmatizes against my conception of God as a preexistent Creator, and who proves himself a dogmatist by denying to that conception the status of a possible alternative to his own, thus ruling it out prior to test and rejecting its claim to the privilege of laying its fruits before men that it may receive their unbiased judgment. I wish only to warn all such dogmatic thinkers that they cannot and will not understand my efforts to rethink Christianity from the standpoint of the logic of science with its undogmatic and scientific *method of hypothesis.*

If it be objected that I cannot be serious in proposing that we test a conception of God that has been tested for nineteen hundred years, I reply that I am serious; I am serious for the reason that, in my judgment, what we have tested in Christianity thus far is the conception of God as Creator *plus a multitude of autocratic and absolute connotations,* which have utterly precluded our experience from being a fair test of this concept of a supernatural God *as we are now in a position to redefine it.* Furthermore, as I have elsewhere tried to

[2] For a fuller treatment of this point see my paper on "Fundamentalism and Experimental Logic" in the *American Review,* 3 : 537-547, (September-October, 1925). Reprints obtainable from Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Missouri.

[3] I have dealt in greater detail with this application of the pragmatic criterion of truth to the field of metaphysics, under the title "A Behavioristic Approach to the Christian Idea of God," in a forty-four page issue of the *Culver-Stockton Quarterly* (Vol. I, Nos. 3 and 4), published by Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Missouri.

make clear,[4] these nineteen centuries of experience with Christianity have been largely wasted so far as an adequate scientific test is concerned, because Christianity has been throughout most of this period under the guidance of a logic that gave experimentation no status whatever as a means of attaining truth.

Thus a fair test of the basic concept of Christianity, its conception of God as Creator and heavenly Father, demands a redefinition of that concept; a consideration which brings us back to our theory that Christian terms used to be redefined, and presents us with the term that is our logical place to begin.

It is a common view among those who are striving, by whatever method, to lead Christians forward to more ethical conceptions of their faith, that the conception of God as preexistent Creator is contradictory to Christ's conception of him as Father. Let us examine this point for a moment. "Preexistent Creator" is an *ontological* term, denoting only God's *existential* relation to the rest of the universe; save by implication it does not touch the ethical field at all. The word "Father," on the contrary, is distinctly an *ethical* term expressing God's *social and ethical* relationship to men. So how can they be contradictory? Would we say that the proposition "John is a good man" contradicts the statement that "John lives in Kansas"? There is certainly a connection between the two, for they both predicate something of the same person, but they are neither contradictory nor contrary, because they deal with entirely different spheres of that person's activity. For exactly the same reason "Creator" and "Father," as applied to God, cannot be contrary, much less contradictory, because one describes God ontologically, and the other, ethically and socially.

For the reason why these terms have appeared contradictory to so many pioneers in modernism, we have not far to seek. The term "Creator" has been used throughout the

[4] "Fundamentalism and Experimental Logic," above cited.

Christian centuries in connection with the term "King" until the meanings of the two have become confused; and the terms "King" and "Father" *are contrary* (although not contradictory, if we would be technically correct)—they are contrary, if the term "King" is taken in the sense of an irresponsible autocrat, for then both terms apply to the same ethical and social sphere and cannot both be true.

Therefore it is clear that God can be conceived as a Creator without touching the question of his ethical relationship to men. Assuredly, if he is Creator of all things except himself, including men, he is in a position himself to choose what is to be his ethical relationship to any moral beings among his creatures; but if he at all approaches the benevolence that many naturalistic thinkers attribute even to Nature itself, there is no reason to suppose that he would choose to be more than a *Father* or *Teacher* to men. Indeed, God could not be an arbitrary Monarch, if man is created in the divine image; for this would mean, among other things, that man is free, that his freedom is like God's freedom in *quality* if not in quantity. In short, God's creation of man as a moral and intelligent being, granting that God himself is moral and intelligent, involves our supposing that God decided to limit himself to an extent which may now be irrevocable even by himself, having honored man with so much of the divine nature as to make him, however finite *quantitatively,* as *qualitatively* indestructible, intelligent and morally free as is God himself.

IV

Thus briefly have I attempted to redefine the term "God," to trace the broad features of a conception, which I suggest not only rejects, but which makes impossible for one who grasps its full force the thought of God as an arbitrary or absolute Monarch over man.

Just how revolutionary such a conception of God may be, and how far-reaching its implications, when adopted as the

key-note for a reinterpretation of both the Old and New Testament accounts of God's dealings with men, I lack space here to show. Suffice it to suggest that after we shall have redefined several score of terms whose use by traditional theology has made them unethical to us, redefined them in the light of this new key-principle, we may be able to see in the whole scope of God's dealings with men as recorded in the Bible a vast, evolutionary program of education undertaken by God for the purpose of teaching his children the way of the more abundant life. We would understand then how a palpable and common fact in our own educational enterprises, that is, the fact that a teacher, however wise, is limited by the limitations of his pupils, would apply to God himself; and by this principle we could explain the apparent crudities of Old Testament revelation as being necessitated by the low level of human culture upon which God dared to base his initial efforts to teach men. We would see also God's reason for using different methods in the kindergarten stages of his educational process, methods which, as described in the Bible, are as different in certain particulars from what he is using at the present time as our educational methods in the kindergarten differ from those that we use in college. In fact, a basic point in my redefinition of the terms "God" and "heavenly Father" is the consideration that we ought to be able now to see that a father cannot be a true father unless he strives to teach his sons all the truth that he knows; and this is to say that when Jesus spoke of God as the Father whose will and wisdom he was striving to *teach* to men, he must have meant to connote to us, who would live in a day that would exalt education and appreciate the factors involved in it, that *a father is a teacher* as well as the biological head of a family, and hence that the term "heavenly Father" would lead to a *conception of God as Teacher, as well as Father,* of man. I am suggesting that Jesus presumed to lay all this, in germ form, before the centuries of humanity, meanwhile realizing the

necessity of making contact with the thought of his time by terms that were familiar to them, such as "*kingdom*" instead of "democracy" and "*commandment*" instead of "principle" or "hypothesis."

One subordinate term, now, to illustrate what may be done with them all: the word "authority," in the light of this educational conception of God, loses all its monarchical connotations and takes on those that, in all but theological spheres of thought, are more familiar to us of the present day. We should experiment with the interpretation that Jesus meant this in a *cognitive* or *scientific* sense, the *authority of one who knows.* This sense not only fits Jesus' rôle as God's representative *Teacher,* but it meets the minds of men today who are in the habit of hearing *authorities* quoted in this field or that.

In conclusion, I again urge the necessity, on the part of those who would judge fairly the theory of redefinition I here undertake to sketch, of experimentally and tentatively thinking of it in terms of its own presuppositions long enough to understand it. What I have here suggested is, in fact, the basic principle of a frankly hypothetic *system of theology,* a system that can be neither judged nor understood piecemeal, but which, because it claims to be no more than hypothetic or pragmatic, surely has a right to ask that it be tested as a whole. It concedes in advance the justice of its being rejected should it fail to play a decisive part in the ethical reorganization that is vital to the continuance of our Western civilization.

# ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES

WHILE many, and often startling, discoveries have been made in the field of archæological exploration, we are to be reminded frequently that hardly more than the scratching of the surface has as yet been achieved. Professor George A. Barton of the University of Pennsylvania, giving some news items from the American Schools of Oriental Research, in a recent number of *The American Journal of Archæology,* tells of the work now being carried on by Professor Dougherty and Doctor Albright. These two scholars and explorers have traveled down the Euphrates, examining mounds on both sides of that historic stream.

Doctor Barton reports:

> Doctor Albright has now returned to Jerusalem, to carry on the work of the school there, and Professor Dougherty is undertaking, as the work of the school of Bagdad this year, a survey of the mounds along the ancient course of the river. While a few of these mounds have been partially explored, a great number of them have never been examined at all and their names are not known. The Iraq government has not only given Doctor Dougherty permission to make soundings in these mounds for tablets and other antiquities, by which their names and importance may be determined, but has furnished him with tents and instruments and also with a military guard. The close cooperation established last year between the government and the American School at Bagdad, and which was so fruitful scientifically in Professor Chiera's excavation near Kirkuk, is maintained by Doctor Dougherty, and promises important scientific results.

The April number of *Art and Archæology* is specially given to the architectural and artistic treasures in and about Philadelphia, *apropos* the coming celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth year of the nation's independence. Pictures of many art treasures of the Revolutionary period, and earlier, are given. The Sesquicentennial buildings are also shown. They appear in marked contrast to those erected for the Cen-

tennial in Fairmount Park fifty years ago—being simpler in design; indeed, they are less elaborate in ornamentation than the buildings of any of the major expositions of the past. Whether this be due to lack of funds or to development of the artistic taste, we are unable to say.

*The Journal of the American Oriental Society* for March contains "Some Notes on Early Christian Baptism," by F. Gavin, of the General Theological Seminary, New York. The Christian world is not so deeply interested as it once was in laying hold of every scrap of evidence, however tiny, that might go to prove this or that form of baptism to have been the mode practised in the early church. Scholarship has come to marked unanimity concerning the matter, and sectaries are not now so inclined as they once were to contend over the matter.

Every now and then, however, some writer threshes over the old straw in some new way. Mr. Gavin, by bringing together fragments from widely scattered sources, is able to raise the question, "Did Saint John the Baptist baptize by aspersion?" (1) John is compared to "a *reed* shaken by the wind" in Matthew 11 : 7. (2) Psalm 51 : 9 reads, "Purge me with hyssop." (3) In the Mishna there occurs the expression, "baptism with hyssop," and hyssop may be used figuratively for reed. (4) In the cemetery of Prætestatus "there is a fresco, dating from the end of the second century," in which a figure touches the head of another with a reed or cane, which may represent baptism! All of which is more interesting than convincing.

The story of the archæology of baptism, as the rite is pictured in early Christian art, supports the testimony from other historical sources that in the first centuries the candidate stood or kneeled in the water when being baptized. Pouring came next (cf. *Didache* VII); and sprinkling was adopted last of all.

## TRAVEL NOTES OF AN EXCAVATOR

THE tourist who visits Mesopotamia, after having admired the splendid monuments of Egypt, will probably feel quite disappointed. Fully aware of the importance of the civilization which flourished on the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates, having heard of Babylon and her hanging gardens, he will be disillusioned by the scarcity of imposing remains. And yet for this he should have been prepared.

The Babyonian plain, of alluvial formation, is practically devoid of stone. Its inhabitants remedied the condition to the best of their ability by building with bricks and, most of the time, with unbaked bricks.

Apart from the destruction which time has wrought to the ancient buildings, there is nothing that can save a wall of unbaked bricks, once it is exposed to the elements, except to cover it up again. In either case, little is left for the tourist to see. Moreover, climatic conditions do not permit the preservation of objects made of wood, leather, linen, or any other kind of perishable material. Little chance of finding in Mesopotamia the artistic treasures such as have come out of Tut-ankh-Amen's tomb.

Notwithstanding all this, Mesopotamia remains one of the richest fields for archæological investigation. And this is simply because the Babylonians had discovered that clay, apart from its use in making bricks, could also be employed as a writing material. When buried in the ground a clay tablet, even if unbaked, will keep forever. Moisture may cause it to become very soft, and earthworms—one is tempted to say bookworms—find no difficulty in burrowing their way through it. Very great care may be needed in extracting it from the ground, but, once dry, it can be handled with perfect safety; it will stand all the necessary brushing and can be made to appear as legible as when first written.

Every scrap of writing, from the more or less successful

effort of a student trying to master the difficult cuneiform writing and the small receipt for a few quarts of barley, up to the elaborate groups of tablets belonging to the royal libraries, everything has been perfectly preserved. There are now buried in the Mesopotamian plain millions of written documents waiting for the excavator and decipherer.

The Biblical writer gives Babylon as the place of the famous tower which was the direct cause of the division of languages. We are now in a position to appreciate the element of truth which underlies that ancient and naive story. For Mesopotamia was the meeting-place for several important civilizations, and the Babylonian tablets are now found to have been written in a large number of different languages. As the work of deciphering progresses, ancient history is being rewritten; our own Bible takes up new meanings, new peoples and new civilizations spring into light.

Before going on the field, I had already formed a fairly good idea of what I could expect, and yet my first impression of Kish was rather disappointing.

The site of that ancient city lies about fifteen miles from Hillah, the nearest railroad station. When I left the train I managed to find a taxi—to be more exact a battered old Ford —and, with difficulty, I successfully contracted for the price of the ride. This was no mean achievement, considering my imperfect knowledge of the language and the difficulties attending all commercial transactions in the East. The ride was not pleasant. In the absence of any road, we were guided only by the tracks of the cars that had preceded us. And it was quite necessary not to lose sight of them, because from time to time we had to cross some irrigation-ditches. If we followed the usual path, we were fairly certain of finding there some little bridges which would permit the crossing. These had been built of pieces of wood laid across the ditch and covered with branches and soil. However, we could never be certain the bridge would be found in place. An Arab

might at any time have destroyed one of them, so as to get the wood necessary for cooking his supper.

We finally reached Kish. Mr. Mackay, who was in charge of the excavations, received me very cordially and led me on a tour of inspection. Imagine a perfect desert, without trace of trees or vegetation. Here and there were small mounds of different height, stretching for miles. Some of the mounds had been excavated in the past, as attested by the gaping holes representing the rooms of the ancient houses. Only a close examination would reveal that what appeared to be dirt was in fact walls of unbaked bricks. The only remains of any importance were those of an ancient Sumerian palace. An ample court, with the lower portions of brick columns, still testified to the ancient magnificence.

Still Kish represents a very important city. It was the oldest settlement of the Semites who had made it their capital, and thence waged constant warfare against the neighboring Sumerians. Here and there the work of excavation was actually going on. The mounds swarmed with Arabs, busy with picks and shovels, while long lines of men and children, in Indian file, carried away the dirt in small round baskets.

Before leaving America, I had seen in a Sunday edition of a Philadelphia newspaper illustrations purporting to show archæological excavations in Mesopotamia, Huge steam-shovels were scooping away tons of sand in a single stroke, quickly filling the railroad cars close by. The artist's conception was certainly very impressive, but absolutely impossible. Steam-shovels are useful in their own fields, but in Mesopotamia they would be quite out of place.

It appeared to me, as I was observing the long line of workmen laboriously carrying their small baskets, that that system might leave some room for improvement. I found out later that this had been tried, and with unexpected results.

An enterprising archæologist decided to do away with the small basket and substitute for it the more efficient wheelbar-

rows. Accordingly, he ordered a good number of them, and had them shipped to his place. While he was calculating the saving of time and money which he had effected by this innovation, the Arab carriers came to him with the report that the wheelbarrows could not be used. They were too heavy.

The archæologist could not understand. It developed that the Arabs were filling them with dirt, and then attempting to carry them on their shoulders. No amount of argument could persuade them to push the things.

Since time immemorial the inhabitants of Mesopotamia had been carying things in small baskets. We have countless statuettes representing ancient rulers with baskets on their heads, busily engaged in constructing temples to the gods. That is the old and approved way. Why change?

That song about the old-time religion, which was good for father and mother and therefore good " enough " for the singer, perfectly interprets the Eastern spirit. It would certainly enjoy great popularity with the Orientals if only the missionaries could be able to teach it. But, then, even the song would be an innovation.

One of the features of the excavations at Kish is the discovery of a large number of ancient tombs, dating back to about three thousand B. C. As is known, in the grave with the dead were buried jars, arms, implements, and sometimes jewelry. For this reason the diggers were told to stop work immediately upon finding a bone. Every once in a while the silence would be broken by the cry: " A dead man." This meant the necessity of immediate and careful supervision.

The skeleton and surrounding objects are first cleared and exposed. By means of a photo or drawing, a record is then kept of the relative position of all objects. These are then removed and a careful search is made for small beads or jewelry. We are then ready to take care of the skull. This is very important, because its measurements will later help to determine the race to which the people belonged.

But a skull five thousand years old is generally in a very poor state of preservation and will crumble into dust if handled too roughly. Before any attempt is made to remove it, it has to undergo special treatment. We had our "kitchen" always ready. A certain number of candles were melted in a small pan and the boiling wax then poured over the skull. A portion of the wax was absorbed by the bones and the rest overflowed on the ground. This was carefully collected, together with all the dirt adhering to it, and the mixture again warmed and poured. The operation was repeated several times, with the result that the skull was finally embedded in a big lump of wax of rather uncertain shape. In this condition, the skull could be taken out of the ground and handled with perfect safety.

The work was far from being clean, and the odor that developed from that burning wax was quite unpleasant. But one found consolation in the thought that, when some months later in a laboratory the reverse process would take place and the wax burned away from the skull, the smell would be even worse.

In common with most peoples of antiquity, the old Babylonians showed great respect for their dead. Further to insure the repose of their dead, they called upon all gods to curse the man who would disturb their bones.

In view of this, I have no doubt that the treatment we were giving to the poor skulls would be regarded by them as the blackest of sins. Quite apart from the fact that we did not believe the curses would ever reach us, we were working in the interest of science, and that was sufficient reason for disregarding prejudices, old and new. And we did not feel at all guilty. As for me I felt rather proud when, at the end of my first job, I marched back to the house, delicately holding a big lump of evil-smelling dirt.

But I did not receive the expected praise. It developed that I had employed twelve candles for a work for which five or six would have been ample. Candles being rather scarce,

I was informed that, unless I learned to be more economical, I would have no light with which to go to bed.

After closing our daily work, I used to take long walks around the ruins. These generally ended at the top of the ziggurat, or temple tower. From there one can get a bird's-eye view of the Mesopotamian plain. About twenty miles away are the ruins of Cutha, the city sacred to Nergal, the god of pestilence and of the underworld. Much nearer are those of Babylon, and around small mounds representing all that remains of the once famous Kish. But there is absolutely no trace of its ancient splendor. Even the river Euphrates, which once passed right through the city, has now moved away, thus adding to the desolation.

A dead city! I have visited Pompeii and Ostia and walked along the empty corridors of the Palatine. But those are not dead cities. They are only abandoned places. The hum of life is still near them; life blooms all around. They represent steps in the march of a civilization to which they have contributed their full share, and which continues under their very eyes.

Here only is real death. Not an arch, not a house still stands as a testimony to the permanency of human work. The very temple tower, the most massive of all constructions, has now lost its original shape. No trace is there of its several stages and of the stairway which led to the top. In the crumbling masonry are black holes, out of which every night jackals issue forth stealthily in search of food. It would seem that the place had been destroyed as the result of a prophetic curse. Changed into a den of jackals is the proud capital of an ancient race.

But we had not time for philosophical meditations. The life on the field is crowded with too many tasks. The laborers need constant supervising throughout the day; maps and plans have to be made, and all objects found need to be card-indexed, described, and sometimes sketched. And then there are the

patients. It will surprise many to say that a rather important part of the archæologist's work consists in acting as physician.

I had my initiation into this new art under Mrs. Mackay, immediately upon my arrival. She was taking charge of all the cases, and I felt my duty to help. At Ur I found Doctor Legrain, of the University Museum, as chief physician, and had opportunity to use whatever knowledge I had been able to pick up. Not that much knowledge was needed. Our stock of medicines was simple: headache medicine and cathartic pills, quinine, iodine, and disinfectants. When one is as good a physician as we, he will need nothing more to cure all sorts of diseases. I forgot to mention that we had also a bottle of salol; but we did not know what it was good for. Doctor Legrain, however, was confident that, after experimenting a little, he would find out. He also went into surgery, and I remember, with a little shudder, a piece cut out of a tin can, which was very sharp and was used in minor operations. That, with a rusty pair of scissors, made up the whole set of instruments.

But, if our stock of medicines was rather poor, still we appear to have used them to very good advantage, for patients kept flocking to us day after day. The cathartic pills found immediate favor with the natives. In fact, cases of indigestion began to multiply at such an alarming rate, that we had to inquire about their cause. This was not far to seek. It was found that our pills, being sugar-coated, were eaten as candy. We substituted castor oil, and much of the suffering disappeared.

The work of the physician is rather trying, under any circumstances. For us it was rendered even more difficult because of our scanty knowledge of Arabic and the very imperfect description of symptoms we could get from our patients. Most of the time we had only a very hazy idea about the nature of the ailment we were supposed to cure. Once a man came who wanted medicine for a member of his family who

suffered from headache. According to systematized knowledge, headaches are caused either from indigestion or from nerves. We were a little uncertain whether to give him headache pills or a cathartic, when further questioning elicited the fact that the sufferer was a year-old baby. That made a difference, at least in the dosage. Encouraged by this first result, we kept on questioning and finally found out that the trouble was an eczema, covering all the head. We gave him boracic acid in powder, hoping it would be of some use.

In spite of our limitations, patients kept on coming to us and, according to their reports, the remedies administered brought the expected relief. But a most wonderful cure, performed by an archæologist—whose name I will not mention—is worth narrating.

Once an Arab, over six feet tall, came to him from a tribe speaking a dialect my friend could not understand. It was quite evident that the fellow suffered from some sort of ailment, but that he could give no clear idea as to its nature.

In his medicine-chest my friend had found a big bottle, without label, which contained some very big pills. This had been packed with the rest by another member of the expedition, who was temporarily absent. He was struck by an idea: "Here is a man suffering from an unknown disease, and here are some pills, with unknown properties. Perhaps the pills will cure the disease." However, being afraid of some poison, he cut one into four parts and told the Arab to take one every day.

The very next morning the Arab came back to offer his thanks, for he had been cured immediately. This left our physician in great curiosity, and at the first chance he inquired about the properties of the miraculous pills: "They are purgative, but so very mild that it would take at least five of them to do any good." This proves this one to have been a faith cure, and I am certain that a good many of ours must have belonged to the same class.

Though the work in Kish was very interesting, and Mr. and Mrs. Mackay showed utmost kindness towards me, still after a while I decided that it was time to move on toward Ur of the Chaldees. The return to Hillah was something of an adventure. In order to save me the expense and trouble of hiring a taxi, two English gentlemen who had come to visit the excavations offered me a place in their car. Unfortunately this was rather small for three of us and the driver; and I can still see, with a certain sense of guilt, one of my traveling companions perched on top of my suitcases and in constant danger of being thrown out of the car by a jolt.

During the day we had had a little rain, and this had partially obliterated the car tracks which should have marked the right road. None of use had seen it more than once; and, to make matters worse, we were leaving the place a little late, so that we had to go at a rather fast pace, if wanted to make Hillah before dark. As we hurried on, the inevitable happened. We had lost our way. We began circling around, trying to locate the elusive tracks, till we lost completely all sense of direction.

The soil of Iraq is crisscrossed by a large number of irrigation-ditches, most of them deep enough to offer an insurmountable obstacle to any car.

Wherever we went we found the way closed by one of these ditches, and we had to retrace our steps. It was getting dark. Our car had only one of its headlights in working order, and this shed a very faint light, four or five yards away.

But the driver was our greatest handicap. He was deaf, dumb, and thoroughly frightened. He was a Jew, and during the time of Turkish rule the Jews were subjected to a number of restrictions. One of these was that they had to remain indoors after five o'clock in the evening. If found outside, they were liable to be killed on the spot by the Arabs. Now the English have abolished all this, but in the small towns the Jews are still afraid to violate the ancient rules.

It was already long past five, and our driver was terrified at the thought of finding himself, at that late hour, in the open country, and therefore away from the protection which the police would offer him in the city. Fear had the best of his judgment, and he sped on in the darkness without the slightest thought of possible ditches or other obstacles.

Being deaf, nothing we could say would reassure him. His employer did not even attempt it, remarking:

"The blooming idiot! Now that he is afraid, he is also blind. I'll teach him to be afraid, if that is what he wants." The poor wretch could not hear the words, but could easily understand that his master was furious, and that helped further to unnerve him. All the while I was sitting beside him, with my hand near the emergency brake and ready for the worst.

Finally, we saw a light and decided to make for it, since we had no other choice. Our radiator was steaming like a locomotive and, besides directions, we needed water. The light came from an encampment of Bedouins of the Shamma tribe. We were immediately surrounded by men, women, and children who expressed the greatest astonishment at the sight of our car. No one of them had seen one before. At our request they brought us water, but only a little cup of it. We made them pour it into the radiator and asked for more, telling them "That kind of a thing drinks a lot." "Does it go on water?" asked one of them. "Unfortunately not" we said, for we were quite uncertain whether our supply of gas would last for the rest of the trip.

But there was something else to worry about. The Shamma Arabs, entirely nomadic and living away from the cities, are not very good company, especially in a desert and late at night. Word had been passed, and we all had our revolvers ready at hand. But our only salvation, in case of trouble, would have been in rapid flight. Our driver was cowering behind a seat, absolutely incapable of quick action.

However, nothing unpleasant happened, and I am certain that what saved us was that Kish is far inland, so that the Arabs would have run the risk of being caught before having time to disappear into the Syrian desert. At Ur, the same adventure might have ended quite differently.

We got water and a guide, but our troubles were not yet over. The fellow who had volunteered to show us the way certainly knew the way to the city. But the route which he wanted us to follow was that taken usually by the camels, and even a small car could not negotiate the narrow path, which ran through ravines and across ditches. We had therefore to stop and try to turn around the obstacles, much to the disgust of our guide who could not understand why his good directions were not exactly followed. When we finally reached Hillah it was past midnight.

From Hillah to Ur of the Chaldees we took the railroad; and a trip on the Iraq railways is an experience in itself. The cars and equipment came from India where they had been discarded after long and faithful service. In Iraq they are now starting all over again. Our train carried a diner but, since the cars were not communicating, one could not reach it until the train came to a stop. The meal ended, we waited for the next station, for a chance to return to our compartment. But the chief characteristic of the Iraq trains is their slowness.

Southern Iraq is absolutely devoid of stones, so that the railroad ties are placed directly on the ground, which is either clay or sand. Under these conditions, the train must always proceed very slowly, and the maximum speed allowed is twenty-five miles an hour. But we never reached that.

The real trouble comes after a heavy rain, which softens the clay and breaks up the line. A construction engineer thus summed up his idea of conditions: "I am always going up and down the line trying to keep the rails together by means of sticking plaster. After a rain I organize the searching parties, and we go around the desert looking for the missing

rails." He was exaggerating, of course, but the fact remains that once, on a tract of fifty miles, they had eighteen "washouts."

Ur of the Chaldees, now jointly excavated by the University of Pennsylvania and the British Museum, is the famous home of Abraham. This association adds popular interest to the undertaking, and probably Abraham has indirectly contributed to the necessary expenses. But I doubt very much if Ur will bring us very much nearer to him than any other city in Mesopotamia. Of course one can always say with perfect truth, while standing in front of the temple tower, "Abraham must have seen this." He could not have missed the huge structure even if he was a few miles from the city. But the fact remains that Ur was a very old Sumerian center and Abraham a nomad Semite. We can gather a good many more facts about "the bringing up of father Abraham" by studying life among the Bedouins of today than by digging anywhere.

I doubt very much if Mr. Leonard Woolley, who is in charge of the work there, is spending very much time in trying to locate Abraham, when much more profitable work is always at hand.

EDWARD CHIERA.

# NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

PROFESSOR NEWMAN has favored us with the following additional note, appropriate to his article on Nestorius published in this issue. It was received after his manuscript was put into type. The recently published material upon this remarkable fifth-century Christian, is illustrative of what interest still gathers about his notable name, and the Christological controversies that raged about him and his devoted followers:

Since this article was written a translation of the entire apology of Nestorius has been published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, under the title "Nestorius: The Bazaar of Heraclides, newly translated from the Syriac and edited, with an Introduction, Notes, and Appendices, by G. R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson, 1925." A critical review of this work by R. H. Connolly, who translated for Bethune-Baker the portions given in his "The Bazaar of Heraclides," appears in the January, 1926, number of *The Journal of Theological Studies*. Connolly suggests a large number of emendations. There are several serious difficulties mooted. The Syriac MS. from which copies have been made and which (if preserved) is still in possession of the Turkish Government, is probably itself imperfect and hard to decipher. The copies that were made of this original vary somewhat among themselves and in some cases can scarcely be made to give a satisfactory sense. The original Syriac is a translation from Nestorius' Greek, and one of the chief problems of the English translations is to determine just what Greek words and phrases are represented by the Syriac. As much depends on very fine distinctions in the Greek texts of the controversial writings of Nestorius, Cyril, and others, it is often a difficult task to decide what Greek expression is represented by the Syriac. The English editors have made much use of the French translations of Bedjan and Nau, and of the elucidatory material furnished by these scholars, but they have used all their linguistic knowledge and critical acumen in trying to improve upon the work of the Frenchmen. Driver, who is a leading Syriac scholar, made the translations. Hodgson, who is a specialist in the History of Doctrines and well acquainted with the Greek terms employed in the Nestorian and Eutychean controversies, went over the entire work with the translator, and assisted with the introduction,

notes, appendices, etc. If a second edition should be called for the editors will probably profit by the friendly suggestions of Connolly. In the number of the *Journal of Theological Studies* referred to there are "Two Notes On the Bazaar of Heraclides," by F. C. Burkitt, himself an eminent Syriac scholar, in one of which a passage represented only by dots in Bethune-Bakers' book is translated in an apparently satisfactory way, as in the other a correction is suggested in the same work, of "cross" for crucifix, Burkitt maintaining that there is no evidence of the use of the crucifix in Constantinople before A. D. 692.

A. H. Newman.

Ever since one of our best religious weeklies, *The Christian Century,* raised the query, Who are our greatest American preachers? and followed up the question by sermons from those adjudged the greatest, a new interest has sprung up in American preachers and their preaching.

In several successive numbers of the Quarterly we propose to give our readers brief estimates, or studies of a number of the ablest of living American preachers, made by men who have had opportunity to evaluate their personalities and their pulpit work. The first of these studies is from Rev. Thomas H. Sprague, of Hollywood, Florida, on Rev. George A. Gordon of Boston, whose forty years in Old South (Congregational) Church, have been a notable ministry. His recent autobiography, "My Education and Religion," has been widely read, and may well be regarded as one of the most important books of its kind that has appeared in recent years.

A study of living preachers can but be a source of instruction and stimulus to younger men in the ministry. *The Homiletic Review* is serving its readers with "Studies of the American Pulpit"—a series of estimates of living preachers in the United States. Whatever may be said to the contrary, men never lose their interest in real preaching, messages from men of prophetic mold. Among such living preachers George A. Gordon stands in the very front rank, for intellectual and moral power.

## "THE GREATEST PREACHER IN THE UNITED STATES"

Naturally there would be a wide diversity of opinion if one should ask the question, "Who is the greatest preacher in the United States?" There are so many standards of judgment, and a man who excels in one point may fall short in many others that go into the calculation.

It is, however, of great interest that one who is generally recognized as a peer among American preachers, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, should recently say that he believed the greatest preacher in the United States today is Dr. George A. Gordon of Boston.

It was my fortune to spend a large portion of the last summer in Boston, and I counted it one of my great privileges that until he went away for his vacation season I was able to find my way to the New Old South Church and listen to this remarkable man.

Whatever may be one's estimate of Doctor Gordon (whether he be classed as liberal, or whatever else best describes what the critic is not), one cannot sit under his preaching without recognizing his evangelical fervor, his love and reverence for the Word, his utter faith in God the Infinite Father, his passionate loyalty to Jesus Christ and his love for his brother man. Marked by a brilliant intellect, chaste diction, simplicity of expression, evangelical fervor, he draws young and old; and I found as I sat beneath his preaching an indefinable something about the man that makes one love him.

No preacher should fail to read Doctor Gordon's autobiography published last summer, entitled "My Education and Religion." It is a marvelous story of what grit, perseverance, and faith can accomplish in the face of what would have seemed to many almost insuperable obstacles.

Born in Scotland in 1853, he came to this country when eighteen years of age; found work in a safe factory in Boston;

then in turn was stone-mason and painter; and then as he tells us, he "became assistant editor to a worthy paper called *The Cherub* which I believe has long ago returned to heaven."

During all of these days he was an inveterate student. In fact his use of spare hours can be imagined when he himself tells us "next to work and the hours of work the most important thing in a man's life is the use he makes of his spare time."

But there was a higher hand than that of man laid upon the young worker and student. God had called him for a wider ministry. After two years as a special student at Harvard he took the degree of A. B. *magna cum laude,* with honors in philosophy. Incidentally, Professor Goodwin, one of his teachers, referred to him as "the best student in Plato and Aristotle that I ever had." In referring to the benefit conferred on the student by the course in college Doctor Gordon says:

> I should say that intellectually the best thing that college did for me was to procure for me open communion with a single line of the world's greatest minds. . . Veneration for the minds that have controlled the thought of the world has become habitual with me; to know some of them, and to have had them as life companions, guides and friends has been a source of help and happiness too great for utterance.

Doctor Gordon has served on three different fields—in Temple, Maine, in Greenwich, Connecticut, and Boston, Massachusetts, where as pastor of Old South Church for forty-one years he has been a bulwark of the gospel of Jesus Christ, winning fame and respect for himself and glory for the Christ he has so faithfully and ardently served. One can not emphasize too strongly the dignity of the minister's calling; and no one more than Doctor Gordon, as the years have come and gone, by precept and example, has won respect for it.

Running the risk of too long quotation, we must insert his words on the profession he has so richly adorned. How greatly we need their emphasis today!

Next to a minister's family is his parish. The educational side again comes before me . . . all that is great in the speculative thinking of the world, all that is most sacred in the religious teaching of the world, the sovereign insights of Jesus into the consubstantiality of God and man, the essential spiritual being of the Infinite and the finite, start into life, offer themselves as light and consecration, when a minister stands in the presence of the ideal demands of the awakened humanity of man. How any minister can be other than a profound thinker, other than an endless metaphysician when moved upon by the tides of human love and sacred solicitude, is something that I cannot understand. In no other profession is there an opportunity so incessant or a motive so vital, so majestic, toward real thinking, toward the endeavor to ground the humanity of man upon the being of the Eternal Lover of man. . . . Let there be everlasting scorn for those who say because a man is a minister he cannot be a thinker; let there be the same scorn for those who meekly accept this indignity.

In his chapter "Education through Friendship," Doctor Gordon, in a most interesting fashion, refers to some of the men who have vitally affected his life. He significantly remarks:

My great friends have not been "thrillers," but standard-bearers: not primarily sources of happy emotion, but examples of what I should aim at and achieve, more of a just and benign judgment unconsciously but habitually rendered, than a satisfaction to feeling.

Among these friends may be mentioned Charles W. Eliot, President Emeritus of Harvard, whom he counted as "the strongest and most influential friend" he ever had. Of Phillips Brooks he wrote:

For moral tonic, for inspiration in the early evolution of Christian character, for the vision of what the Christian preacher should be and what he might hope to achieve, it would be difficult if not impossible for me to overestimate my obligation to Phillips Brooks,

and William James to whom he declared he

was happy to know him before he became famous; that he never knew a fairer mind, one more sensitive to evidence for or against himself, one more candid, or more willing to give even the devil his due.

But Doctor Gordon is not only a great man and a great preacher, he is also a great *pray-er*. I do not know that I have ever been led in prayer by one who manifested greater reverence in the presence of God, who was less marked in his petitions by shallow, superficial desires, by trite and hackneyed expressions or by professional cant. Almost invariably he begins his prayers with the words "Infinite Father," and as he prays one feels that God is indeed all that those words convey, and also the loving tender present Father. I cannot do better than close this brief reference to the splendid autobiography of one of America's greatest preachers than with one of his prayers at the close of a service:

Infinite Father, grant us heart and hope in the tumult of this mixed world in which thou hast given us our life, in which thou has set our struggle and our goal. Help us not to be faint-hearted; help us to see the evil and the good that are everywhere, but also help us to see that good, in its high contention, may win a wise mind and a valiant will, a heart made clean and deep, resting on the heart of God. And help us, our Father, to listen to no dissuasives from endeavor in our own personal struggle with uncleanness and wrong; and may nothing keep us back from taking our place in the ranks of those who are soldiers of the well-being and freedom of mankind. May we see the issue of all things to be the new universe through him, flowing forth from the perfect Will of God. Help us to wait, dowered with love and harnessed by duty, till the day break and the shadows flee away.

THOMAS H. SPRAGUE.

# WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

Professor Douglas Clyde Macintosh is Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University. He is a native of Canada, and a Baptist. He is one of our clearest thinkers. In the article we publish on " The Baptists and Church Union," Professor Macintosh undertakes to present the essential Baptist position, and to suggest a possible union with other bodies of Christians without violence to historic Baptist principles. At a time when church union is much debated and when the Baptist position has been reinterpreted by many leading Baptists, the article will be read with keen interest.

We are giving our readers a scholarly treatment of the subject of "Art and Dramatism in Worship," by the late Professor E. E. Ayres, whose work in Crozer Theological Seminary as teacher of New Testament Exegesis greatly endeared him to those with whom he was associated and those who sat under his instruction. All his life Doctor Ayres gave appreciative attention to music, to art, and to forms of public worship. This article, found among his manuscripts, will be read with deep interest and profit by all who lead in public worship, and who wish to understand the history, as well as the psychology of worship forms. This essay lays the foundation for a second, which we propose to publish in the next issue, from the same pen, on " Baptists and Their Worship "—written as a continuation of the same general theme, and designed to be helpful in guiding worship forms in non-liturgical churches.

President Frank L. Anderson, of the International Baptist Theological Seminary, East Orange, New Jersey, is a native of Minnesota. He received his formal education at his State University and in the Divinity School of the Uni-

versity of Chicago. After pastorates in the Northwest, he was elected president of the newly formed Theological Seminary for foreign-speaking students, in which position he has served since the year 1920. Doctor Anderson undertakes to grapple with the difficult question of a minister's readjustments in a rapidly changing world.

Professor Albert Henry Newman of Mercer University is known everywhere for his painstaking research and able treatment of subjects in the department of Church History. He is not unknown to our readers, who will recall his article on "An Antipedobaptist Holy Catholic Apostolic Church," in the Crozer Quarterly for October, 1924.

Professor Ralph W. Nelson, the professor of Philosophy at Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Missouri, is a native of Kansas, having received his academic training at Princeton, Yale, and the University of Chicago. He has given much thought to problems which lie on the border-land between religion and science, and their so-called conflicts. In the thought-provoking article which he furnishes for this issue of the Quarterly, Professor Nelson discusses the very important question of terms—which is truly vital, since clear thinking and understandable thinking both depend upon them. Particularly does the problem become serious in a progressive thought world, or in a realm of knowledge that is continually expanding.

# BOOK REVIEWS

**A Century of Excavation in Palestine.** R. A. S. Macalister. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1926.

Doctor Macalister tells the story of an American who was fired with ambition to excavate in Palestine, and in order to raise the necessary funds approached a wealthy relative with his proposition. Among the questions raised by the very cautious friend was the ultimate purpose of such work. Thinking to appeal to well-known sympathies the solicitor for funds replied, "To prove the truth of the Bible." But he was immediately met by the query "Yes, but suppose you prove the Bible ISN'T true, what then?" The author then goes on to show that this attitude is quite beside the mark. The archæologist must not go to work for the purpose of proving anything. His aim must be to find the facts, whatsoever they may be, and then to let these tell their own story, colored as slightly as possible by any previous theory of the worker. Only thus can we ever arrive at truth. He then goes on to suggest that what is actually gained by such work is illustration rather than confirmation, historical background rather than foreground, atmosphere rather than historical detail.

In the process however the student is likely to have to part with many old interpretations. New light will certainly dim the old and at least occasionally will present the scene in an entirely different perspective. Nothing is harder than gracefully to say farewell to theories which have become a part of our thinking. Who is ready without a struggle to part with Bishop Heber's hymn?

> By cool Siloam's shady rill
> How fair the lily grows.

No doubt the Bishop was an intelligent man as well as pious and poetically gifted. But here his imagination was unhampered by information and provided an atmosphere that never was on sea or land. The hymn has become a part of our religious inheritance and always carries with it a wealth of emotional reaction. From childhood it has been singing itself into the very fiber of our being, but now the student of Siloam and vicinity tells us that almost from first to last its descriptions are fictitious. Thus the discoveries of the spade have wrought havoc with the meditations of the pious. This is the price that always must be paid in the search after truth. By the wayside there will always lie those wrecked theories that, unable to survive the stern struggle, are the surest evidences of progress.

A century of excavation in Palestine! What changes have been wrought in our understanding of that country and its ancient civilization! A century ago Dr. Edward Robinson of the Theological Seminary at Andover was planning to write a small volume on Bible Geography, but he found the knowledge of the day altogether inadequate for such a work. Hence a hundred years ago Palestine was largely a land of pious tradition shrouded in romance, a veritable terra *incognita*. Indeed many pilgrims had visited the land and an occasional diary of the journey or a treatise on some phase of the life of the country had been passed on to posterity. But the pen of the writer was usually prompted by a credulous traditionalism rather than by critical research.

Little was accurately known about Palestine by the great body of religious teachers in the West. Few even of the most important places named in Scripture were located with certainty. The customs of the people were known only in the most superficial way. The religious practises and ideas of the common people, which are so often directly related with those of the Biblical times, had been studied by no competent student. The flora and the fauna were unrecorded; the mounds of ancient cities with their treasure were all untouched, and one of the most remarkable features in the country, the fact that the Dead Sea lies some 1,300 feet below the surface of the Mediterranean, was not even guessed at by any one. Even the language of the people was imperfectly known, while the cognate languages, Arabic, Babylonian, and Assyrian, shed no ray of light on any of the problems of the Old Testament.

What a change! The work of a century has illuminated almost every page of the Bible. Not very many men have been at work in the field, owing to lack of financial support, but their labors have been abundantly rewarded. Returns more adequate than in most educational investments have been reaped. Beyond the borders of the strictly Palestinian field, contributory knowledge from Babylonia, Assyria, Syria, and Asia Minor, has been flowing in an almost uninterrupted stream for three-quarters of a century to the great enrichment of the Old and New Testament life and literature. But Doctor Macalister has limited himself to the smaller and less startling work of Palestine proper, and in five well-arranged chapters he has given us the history and the results of the work of a hundred years.

The advance in knowledge has been most gratifying. The scholar now has a fair command of the ancient language of the Hebrews. The cognate languages, which unlock the histories of the nations of the past, are an open sesame to many. Old social customs, the home life, the village relations, the laws of hospitality, the ceremonies at birth, at mar-

riage, and at death, the common life of the community, at play, at work, and at worship, all have come under the scrutiny of the student, and the old world of active human relationships has been pretty thoroughly rehabilitated. So has it been all along the line. Ancient places, ancient history, ancient culture, and ancient religion, each phase of life has received a marked increment of knowledge from the hand of the excavator.

It is the story of this contribution to thought that Professor Macalister traces in this volume. The author is himself an expert in the field of archæology. His work in Gezer, from 1902 to 1908, has made for him a lasting place among pioneers in this kind of work. This volume summarizes in a very admirable way the important results of the work of the century. The book is well written, and is supplied with thirty-six excellent illustrations. A careful perusal of its pages will give the reader information on Palestine that is up to date and will correct many popular misconceptions. It would be well worth the expenditure of money and time, for every preacher and Bible teacher to possess and thoroughly master this volume. It would help one to relive the ancient scenes and furnish him with much valuable illustrative material in his use of the Bible.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

**Israel and Babylon.** W. LANSDALE WARDLE. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

WITHIN a compass of 335 pages the author has succeeded in treating the relations and parallels between Israel and Babylon in a very comprehensive manner. The aim of the book is to help those who are interested in the exposition of the Old Testament but have not access to the vast amount of material that is published in translations and histories or have not the time necessary to master it at their disposal. In his aim he has succeeded.

Chaper V presents a valuable discussion on the origins of Hebrew Monotheism. The significant passages in the Old Testament, such as Amos 4 : 13; 5 : 8; 9 : 1-7; Isaiah 29 : 15, 16; 7 : 20; 10 : 5; Jeremiah 25 : 3-11; Isaiah 41 : 2-7, and others are interpreted and compared with those passages in Babylonian and Egyptian that are more or less similar. The author draws from this study the conclusion that while there may be similarity of phrasing in some cases, and while there may have been in Babylon and in Egypt a "latent monotheism," yet it is quite different from Old Testament monotheism. The one is a vague, philosophical speculation; the other is related to vital religion. The one is the product of a syncretism; the other is quite intolerant of syncretism. The one is esoteric; the other strives to impress itself on the popular

conscience. The one was slightly if at all related to social relations; the other laid a tremendous emphasis on ethics. Hence it seems to the author that neither Babylon nor Egypt exercised any decisive influence on this phase of the religion of Israel.

In the stories of the Creation, of Paradise and the Fall, of the Deluge, and of the Sabbath the parallels are carefully and fully canvassed. Relationship and influence is here recognized. But there is no certainty that there was borrowing in any real sense of that word. Ofttimes the stories must go back to a common source. In all cases, the writer concludes, and that with adequate evidence, the moral tone that pervades the Hebrew stories is unquestionably the superior.

The conclusion to the whole matter is twofold. First, that Israel was influenced, and that in many very important ways, by the civilization that passed up and down her borders during her history, and that Babylon stood well to the fore in this influence. But, second, if in part the external form of religious expression is related to that of their illustrious kinsmen, the inward spirit of the Hebrew religion was peculiarly her own. "That which we most value in the Hebrew religion was not borrowed: it grew out of the spiritual experience of Israel's great leaders and prophets." The book is well written and is discriminating in its judgments.

I. G. Matthews.

**Babylonian Life and History.** E. A. Wallis Budge. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

This is a new edition of an old, well-known book. In 1883 the author published, at the request of the Religious Tract Society, a small volume under the same title. While this volume served a good purpose as an introduction to Babylonian life and history, forty years is a long time in the life of a book, especially one on such a theme. Requested by the editor of the Tract Society to revise the earlier edition the author found it was necessary to rewrite it completely. Hence this is a new book rather than a new edition. All the work of the Assyriologists has been laid under tribute and we now have a reliable introduction to most phases of Babylonian life and culture and their relation to much of the Old Testament.

The first chapter is devoted to a treatment of the country itself. Its characteristics, its early population, its first cities, and its general culture are presented very briefly. Then follows a chapter on chronology and history, which presents about as many facts as the layman wishes to know. A chapter on the city of Babylon is followed by a very brief but excellent

epitome of the Babylonian stories of Creation and of the Flood. Then in twenty pages the author treats the Babylonian religious beliefs. Here we find *multum in parvo;* and not the least significant feature is the occasional comparison with what we find in the Biblical literature. The code of Hammurabi is presented in full, and then follows a chapter on the Babylonian religious and magical texts. The remaining part of the book presents in general the Babylonian culture and a brief statement of British Museum excavations.

In all its parts the book is brought up to date. The excavations in Ur of the Chaldees in 1923-25, under the joint auspices of the British Museum and the University of Pennsylvania, has fortunately been included and has been fully treated. Many features of Babylonian culture might be made the subject of special mention. The abundant literature of so many and so varied types; the persistent fear of death on the part of Babylonians; the eager search after immortality; the innumerable demons and the evil devil; the elaborate pantheon; the seven heavens and the seven hells; the descent of Dumzi into the underworld; the development of the mystery religion; the values in the Babylonian laws and the apparent lack of the idea of repentance, these and many other themes would be worthy of discussion if space permitted. But two features are noticeable throughout the volume. This is the work of a man who is an Egyptologist. The constant comparisons with things Egyptian is very illuminating. The author also is not a Pan-Babylonianist. He gives full value to the contributions of Babylonia to the civilizations of the ancient East. But he believes that the simple and very primitive civilization of Palestine had in it an inherent worth which was superior in moral and spiritual conceptions to that of the older and more highly developed culture. We are fortunate in having on the market this excellent compendium.

I. G. Matthews.

**The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary.** Burton Scott Easton, D. D., Professor of the Interpretation and Literature of the New Testament, the General Theological Seminary, New York City, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1926. Pp. xl, 367. Price, $3.50.

Professor Easton has given us a commentary on the Third Gospel which should be of real value. His purpose is primarily to answer the question, "What meaning did St. Luke expect his readers to find in his Gospel?" To this end he has separated the critical from the exegetical portion of the volume, usually printing the latter in small type after the exposition of the verses in question.

In a very brief introduction he has indicated the literary relationship existing between Luke and the other two Synoptists. He accepts the Two-Document theory as the key to the Synoptic problem, but agrees with Bernhard Weiss and Canon Streeter that in addition to Mark and Q a third written source, L, intensely Jewish in character, must be recognized. But unlike Streeter he feels it unnecessary to assume that our Luke used a combination of Q and L. While not impossible, it is simpler to view Q and L as separate documents. Lists of the sections assigned to each of three sources are most conveniently given.

Unlike many commentators of the Synoptic Gospels, Doctor Easton has made real use of the proposed solution in the exposition of the Gospel. In fact, instead of arguing at length in the introduction for the view adopted, he has been content to state it, leaving the detailed proof for the commentary itself, where it is used with telling effect.

He refuses to allow himself to be sidetracked by critical questions as to the historic nature of the incidents described. His one aim is to deal with the self-consistency of the narrative itself. Of the facts underlying incidents open to some historic question, he is not concerned, save occasionally to notice the "perfect naturalness of the story" (p. 49), or its "perfect simplicity" (p. 32), or, as in the case of the coming of the shepherds (2 : 8-20), that "critical discussion of this perfect story is idle" (p. 25).

The exposition is clear and sane. In some places one could wish it were more detailed, but the lengthy recital of what is perfectly obvious, which so frequently mars commentaries, is noticeably absent. Textual critical notes are regularly relegated to the small-print sections, and usually to foot-notes. Space has been conserved by a rather arbitrary system of abbreviations, the key to which is given in the opening pages.

Both author and publishers are to be congratulated for the production of a work which should prove of real worth for the understanding of this voice from the past.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

**The First Age of Christianity.** ERNEST F. SCOTT, D. D., Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 242.

THE past few months have seen the issuance from the presses of several books which attempt in semipopular style to provide a bird's-eye view of the origins of Christianity. It is not inconceivable that a more pretentious work, three volumes of which are now available, and with the conclusion of which some disagree, more or less violently, has contributed

to this production. After a continued period of close study of separate problems, the results of which naturally are of interest chiefly to professional students, it is but natural that the attempt should be made to present the conclusion in brief form for those who desire to keep abreast of modern thought, but who have not the time and perhaps the equipment to familiarize themselves with the intricate detail of specialized study. Few scholars are in a better position to meet this need than is Professor Scott. His writings on the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews have shown his capacity to grapple with individual problems; his new book reveals his grasp of the subject as a whole.

In clear crisp style he has described the birth and development of the organism we know as Christianity. Against the historical background of Palestine at the end of the Maccabean period and now a part of the Roman Empire stands the figure of Jesus, as revealed by and under the Gospel records. His ministry, passion, and teaching are sketched in such a way that the two thousand years that separate us from him are for the moment rolled away.

Then follows the unfolding history of the Christian church, prominent in which stands the apostle Paul. While no formal analysis and introduction of his writings is given, they are shown in their historic connection as a real part of his missionary work, not a later appendix. Paul was in fundamental agreement with Jesus, though the manner in which he described the vital principle of the new message—faith, liberty, moral renewal, loyalty to Christ in whom God had revealed himself, and power which had entered the world through him—was often different. Indeed Paul's desire "not to know Christ after the flesh" made him unwilling "to repeat his precepts in their familiar historical form."

We are warned not to forget that after all Paul, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and "John" were not representative of the church as a whole. The great bulk of Christians lagged far behind their gifted leaders. Too often they failed to catch the salient note, and were content to exaggerate and distort. It soon became the tendency to use the productions of those unfettered minds who would have been first to acknowledge that they "had not yet apprehended" as a final and unchangeable statement of all Christian truth. Nor is this seen only in the recent years. Even those who followed hard on the first century were no longer exploring a new and marvelous country. They were but too content to follow in the course mapped out by the pioneers.

Perhaps the extreme brevity of the book and the desire to keep away from critical details account for the occasional curt rejection of views with which the author disagrees, as for example: "One fact is

hardly open to question—that the Gospels were composed in Greek, as we now have them, and were based on documents which were also in Greek" (p. 50). An increasing number of investigators would hardly agree. Or again, the question which has been raised by several eminent scholars as to Jesus' Messianic claim may hardly be dismissed with the turn of the hand: "But this view is utterly unwarranted" (p. 104). Nor would all, and not a small minority either, agree that "No sufficient reason for questioning Luke's authorship of the whole work [Acts] has yet been brought forward" (p. 109f.). Several times one notes the recurrent refrain: "It has sometimes been held that . . . . but the truth is." Had Doctor Scott more room he would certainly have qualified these rather bald statements.

But these flaws serve to provoke thought, and so perhaps are not an unmixed evil. Certain it is that the volume as a whole is an excellent piece of work, one might say indispensable for the man who would keep in touch with the work of those who are discovering that which is new in that which is old.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

**The Portraits of Jesus Christ in the New Testament.** HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, Minister in the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, and Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 96.

IN spite of the warning sounded by Dr. J. Fort Newton in the preface to his collection of "Best Sermons of 1925," that expository preaching is "well-nigh impossible in America," Doctor Coffin essayed a series of eight sermons, purely expository in character, from his Madison Avenue pulpit. Their cordial reception has led him to offer them to a wider circle through the printed page. Though it must be confessed that the average printed sermon, divorced from the magnetic power of the preacher, makes very dreary reading, these of Doctor Coffin prove happy exceptions.

As every man today sees qualities and characteristics in Jesus that he will especially stress, so it was with the writers of the books of the New Testament. Each one portrays him in a different light, against a different background. A composite picture that includes every item is farthest from their aims. There is, indeed, no "Christ of the New Testament" as such. In its stead are the Jesus of Paul, the Jesus of Mark, the Jesus of Hebrews, the Jesus of John. Back of them all stands the Jesus of history, whose living spirit quickened to expression their widely different portrayals.

Again the pictures are not photographs but rather portraits. Not

alone the subjects but the artists also are of moment. The lines they drew are not those of sinister accuracy but the joyous expression of the fires enkindled in the artists' lives.

Doctor Coffin's ripe scholarship and fine literary taste have enabled him to catch to the full the spirit of the various writers. The concluding sermon—the Portrait according to John—is particularly fine; indeed it would be hard to see how it might be bettered. A congregation that is privileged to listen to preaching such as this is singularly blessed.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

**The Holy Spirit in the Gospels.** J. RITCHIE SMITH, D. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 394.

THE author is Professor of Homiletics in Princeton Theological Seminary. In the preface he describes the contents of his book and the method of preparation as follows:

> This volume comprises a series of exegetical studies, in which every passage of the four Gospels relating to the Holy Spirit is examined that its precise significance may be discovered. Abundant use has been made of the labor of many scholars in this field; but it has been the constant endeavor to ascertain by the close and direct study of the text, in humble reliance upon the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit, what he has chosen to reveal of his nature and his office.

This volume must be judged in the light of the author's description of it. It is "a series of exegetical studies." The studies were evidently made at different times, and presumably each study of the series had its own immediate purpose. There is also a homiletic quality in the studies that must be kept in mind in evaluating their worth as a strictly objective representation of Scriptural teaching.

The author divides his material into three parts. Part I treats of "The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament" in order to give the historical background of what he conceives to be the New Testament teaching. His place in history of theological thought may be judged from such sentences as:

> There is no doctrine of the New Covenant which is not potentially and germinally contained in the Old. We find, accordingly, hints and suggestions in the earlier record which are seen in the light of the New Testament to be adumbrations of the Trinity. There are plural forms of the divine name with which singular verbs and adjectives are usually joined. . . No sufficient reason has been shown why we should set aside the Scripture representation that the worship of the one living and true God was the primal religion of the race. Man has not risen from the false to the true; he has fallen from the true to the false. Decaying monotheism crumbles into polytheism. . . There are indications, moreover,

of the number of Persons in the Godhead, and their various characteristics and offices. Here of course we are reading the Old Testament in the light of the New.

The confession of this last sentence makes at least one reader wonder whether this is exegesis of the Old Testament or eisegesis of the New into the Old. It prepares him, too, to note whether in subsequent pages the author is not reading the New Testament in the light of the Patristic Fathers, the Ecumenical Creeds, the Westminster Confession, and later Dogmatic Theology. Whether this be true, can be verified by reading Parts II and III.

Part II deals with "The Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus," in which there is a discussion of historical material rather than a study of the Holy Spirit. Here we find a good summary of the exegetical questions raised by comparison of the narratives of the birth of Jesus; and an interesting survey of the passages which connect the Holy Spirit with incidents in the public ministry of our Lord.

Part III comes to close grip with the material suggested by the title of the book. It treats of passages in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Fourth Gospel in which Jesus speaks of the Holy Spirit. Here the author does not distinguish clearly between the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the early church. In this portion of his book it is most evident that he is embodying the material of "a series of exegetical studies," in which the main interest is doctrinal rather than exegetical. Here, too, the homiletic and practical interests are to the fore, and are helpful and suggestive, and the author's desire "that the truth written may have quickening and sanctifying power" will be realized in the hearts of those who read.

Two excellent indexes enable the reader to locate quickly the scholars to whom he refers, and the Biblical texts he interprets. Since the author's aim is to study every passage of the four Gospels relating to the Holy Spirit, the "Index of Text," covering thirteen pages, is of special value, for the passages discussed at length are marked by an asterisk (*). This makes the volume a sort of topical concordance with notes for the study of the phrase "the Holy Spirit" as the author understands the phrase.

MILTON G. EVANS.

**Pen Portraits of the Prophets.** BERNARD C. CLAUSEN. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 175.

THE brilliant minister of the First Baptist Church, of Syracuse, N. Y., adds to his former output "Pen Portraits of the Twelve," another volume, on twelve of the leading Old Testament prophets. The preacher does not undertake to treat the work of any of the preachers of righteousness

as a whole, but picks out some salient feature of each of them and talks charmingly about that. We say *talks,* for the spoken style dominates, though the title of the collection is Pen Portraits. They are rather charcoal sketches of the several prophets in some one characteristic attitude. Sometimes these attitudes are quite peculiar to the subject of the sketch, sometimes incidental, and sometimes they might equally characterize most of the others; but always they are pertinent and interesting. Isaiah is "The Preacher Who Stirred Up Trouble"; Amos, "The Preacher Who Never Went to School"; Hosea, "The Preacher Whose Heart Was Broken"; Micah, "The Preacher Who Pitied the Poor"; Jeremiah, "The Preacher Who Buried His Clothes," etc.

These portraits will prove valuable to the preacher who has not learned the art of not being deadly dull when he undertakes to bring some of the results of literary and historical scholarship to the interpretation of the Old Testament for popular audiences. Saul asked the Witch of Endor to call up a dead prophet. Doctor Clausen has the artistic witchery to make twelve old prophets come back to life and "say their say" in vivid twentieth-century English.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**The Call to Prophetic Service.** HENRY SCHAEFFER, PH. D. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 459. Price, $3.25.

THIS is the most elaborate study of the prophetic call with which the reviewer is acquainted. It begins with Abraham and ends with Paul—taking up every important and definite call to divine service, recorded in Scripture, between these master spirits—Moses, Samuel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Jonah, John the Baptist, Jesus, and The Twelve. Professor Schaeffer occupies the chair of Biblical Interpretation in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Chicago. His chief interest in these chapters, however, is not critical or historical, though all is thrown upon the background of the period in which the characters discussed lived and moved. The critical judgments of the author, as well as the theology, are of the conservative type. Professor Cleland B. McAfee, of McCormick Seminary, writing the Foreword, sees two uses for such a treatise as this; one, for the benefit of those who recognize that they themselves are in the line of prophetic service of today, and another, for those who face the possibility of a call to such service. Since, however, the principles of service are intrinsically alike for all, whether specially called to the prophetic office or not, any Christian may have his sense of personal responsibility deepened by reading this book; and a thoughtful minister will find in it the basis for a helpful

series of sermons. A summarizing chapter bringing together inductively the essential elements of all divine calls to service would have increased the interest and value of the studies.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**The Worship of Nature.** SIR JAMES GEORGE FRAZER, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. xxvi, 672.

IN 1924 and 1925 the author of the well-known "The Golden Bough" and "Folk Lore in the Old Testament," delivered the Gifford Lectures before the University of Edinburgh. Students of the history of religion have been eagerly awaiting the publication of the lectures. Now they have appeared, together with much material that could not be compressed within the limits of the time allotted for the lectures. The public expects nothing superficial or trivial from this justly renowned scholar. He long has been an authority in descriptive anthropology. These Gifford Lectures show wide research and thoroughgoing discussion and interpretative insight. They treat mainly the worship of Sky, Sun, and Earth, in its forms and social effects.

In this volume the author deals with this phase of nature-worship according to the races in which it is found. He first collects material from the ancient Aryan-speaking peoples, the Vedic Indo-Aryans, Persians, Greeks, and Romans; then, the ancient Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, the civilized nations of the Far East, China, and Indo-China; and finally the backward peoples in India, Asia, the Americas, and Africa.

Unfortunately there is no index, but the table of contents is quite extensive, and to a degree compensates for this defect in modern bookmaking. Foot-notes refer to authorities quoted and direct the reader to an almost inexhaustible supply of information. Every one interested in religion, in its history and its manifold variety in ritual and thought, ought to have this volume for ready reference on the subjects treated. In another volume the author proposes to complete the survey of the worship of the Sun and to deal with the personification and worship of other aspects of nature, both inanimate and animate. It is to be hoped that the purpose may be executed at no distant day, if an appendix in the present volume is an example of the new material in the author's possession.

In the course of this present volume he gives numerous instances of African stories concerning the Fall of Man, or the Origin of Death. The appendix alluded to tells of a curio described as follows, together with the African native's explanation:

> It is a round wooden pot with a lid to it. On the lid is the seated figure of a little old man hunched up, his chin resting in his two hands, his elbows on his

knees. There is a mildly amused expression on the rudely carved face; whether this is there by accident or design, I cannot say.

On one side of the pot is a snake in relief; on the other a tortoise.

I bought this pot from a very old native. So old was he that his scanty knots of hair were quite white, and his eyes were very dim. He must have been a fine enough man once, but now his dull, grayish-black skin clung in folds about his gaunt frame.

I paid the old man the modest price he named, and asked him the meaning on the lid and sides of the pot.

The following is his explanation, given is short, jerky sentences, done into English as literally as our language will permit:

"Yes, it was a long time ago. So long ago was it that no white man had then come to this country. It was before my father's day. Before that even of his father. Both died old men. Yes, so long ago was it, that only the old people now speak of those past times. It was when men did not grow old and die. There was no death then; all men lived on, and happily.

"One day all this was changed. God became angry—that is God on the lid of the pot. What foolish things men did to make God angry, I cannot say. He must have been very angry.

"In his anger, God sent his messenger of death to men. He sent his messenger the snake. Then people began to die—that is the snake on the side of the pot.

"So many people died that all became frightened. They thought all would soon be dead. In their fear they cried to God. They said they were sorry for their foolish act—whatever that might have been. They promised they would anger him no more. They begged him to recall his messenger the snake.

"After a while God agreed. He said he would recall his messenger, the snake. He promised to send another messenger—that is the second messenger on the other side of the pot. God sent a tortoise to recall the snake."

The old man paused and mused for a little while, and then resumed:

"When I was a young man, I thought to myself perhaps the tortoise will overtake the snake; that some day he will deliver God's message. I am an old man now. I do not think the tortoise will ever overtake the snake—at least, not in my time."

He said all this without a trace of emotion. He was too much of a philosopher, it seemed, to indulge in anything so profitless as self-pity.

"Do you kill snakes when you see them?" I asked.

"No!" said he. "Why should I? But I do kill tortoises. The tortoise is very lazy. He runs with his message so slowly. Moreover, a tortoise is good meat."

Having told his story and pouched the price of his pot, the old man rose painfully and hobbled away.

Just outside my compound gate, he paused and made a vicious stab at something in a patch of grass.

. . . . . .

Shouldering his assegai, he passed on his way; a writhing tortoise impaled upon the blade.

May a moral lesson be permitted? When God sends a messenger of death and a messenger of life, why is the messenger of life always so

slow? Is it any wonder savage peoples hate animals that are believed to thwart God's good purpose.

Are the Matotela wrong in their moral judgments when they kill a tortoise that brings a message of life too late, thus depriving them of immortality?

MILTON G. EVANS.

**Progressive Christianity.** WILLIAM A. VROOMAN. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 377.

THIS ably written volume presupposes, if it does not prove, that we are in the midst of a quiet, but very powerful reformation, as the subtitle would indicate: "A Study of the Old Faith and the New Reformation."

The author makes the familiar distinction between the religion of Christ and the Christian religion. The religion of Christ is progressive, while the Christian religion, as many conceive it, has been forever "delivered," and is always the same. The former

> seeks to embody the principles and ideals of the religion of Jesus in modern life, at the same time releasing men from intellectual bondage to antiquated forms of belief;

the later is a "finished and infallible dogmatic system," to be believed, or else one cannot have the Christian experience. This leads to a chapter on "Christian Creed and Character." It is needless to add, that Creed is sent to the rear, and Character advanced to the front. "The Bible of Orthodoxy" is a Book infallible in every particular; while the "Bible of Modern Heresy" is the life of the Spirit out of which all Bibles grow.

"The Christ of the Creeds" is contrasted with the "Christ of Progressive Christianity." The former is a Christ of Dogma, of metaphysical speculation, a mixture of Hebrew Messianism and Hellenic-Oriental philosophy—a Logos-Messiah. The latter is one who came to show "the Christlikeness of God," a Father God.

The writer of the book, a militant Unitarian, writes partly at least, for the apparent purpose of showing that all Modernists should go all the way to Unitarianism, should come frankly and fully into the Unitarian fold. He is therefore critical of Modernism, as well as of Fundamentalism. We shall quote a paragraph or two which will give a good sample of the general position and flavor of the book:

> Modernists are busy moving the dogmatic artillery to the rear, in many churches, though not prepared to scrap it entirely. By skilful camouflage it may be serviceable still, not in warfare on those without, but on reassuring the timid, within the fold. The Fundamentalists, however, oppose this strategy and volunteer to

man the old guns at the front and keep them in action. They fear the defeat of the armies of God if they are not guarded by their creeds. That any one should presume to serve God, without a pledge to maintain unchanged the authorized version of Christianity, fills them with dismay. Those who serve in the ranks must learn to pronounce correctly their sectarian shibboleths to qualify for a commission. Advancement is made to depend upon loyalty to the faith "once delivered to the Saints."

But a new Protestantism is rising with broadened vision, which says with Principal Garvie: "In spite of the prominence of ethics in the teaching of Jesus and the apostles, the Christian Church has hitherto paid more attention to dogmatics, the definitions of the objects of faith, than to ethics, the exposition of the ideals of life. We now think of Christianity, not as a creed to be believed, a code to be obeyed, a ritual to be observed, but as a life to be lived."

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**Putting on Immortality.** CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1926. Pp. 189. Price, $1.50.

HERE are ten "reflections on the life beyond" by the well-known protagonist of modern Fundamentalism—if this be not a contradiction in terms. Doctor Macartney handles an old question: "If a man die shall he live again." He does not handle it in a new way, but in a very effective way for his purpose. The treatment is sermonic, rather than speculative; and since it keeps very close to the human heart's deepest yearnings, it cannot fail to be comforting to those who rejoice in the hope of a life to come, and who long to be again in the fellowship of those whom they have loved, and lost a while.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**Imagination and Religion.** S. PARKES CADMAN, D. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. Pp. 208.

DOCTOR CADMAN is the wonder man in the pulpit. How he manages to read so much, assimilate so much that he reads, and give out so much from pulpit, platform, and press, to say nothing of the radio, is a marvel to his brethren. Besides, his publishers name him "the ranking publicist of the American pulpit."

The chapters which compose "Imagination and Religion," are the Cole Lectures, delivered at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. They are six: The Power of Imagination, The Wonders of Imagination, The Perils of Imagination, Imagination in Man's Spiritual Growth, Imagination and the Bible, and the Christ of Romance—to which is appended a suggested reading-list. The first two chapters are replete with facts and allusions that set forth the rich place imagination has played in all the arts,

sciences, and adventures of life. Among the perils of the imagination are not only such evils as day-dreaming and those dark perversions which lead to the over-stressing of the morbid and the purveying of the obscene, but also the arraying of science and religion against each other, ecclesiastical controversies, and unbalanced sectarianism.

The value of imagination for proper appreciation of the Bible is forcefully set forth, a truth of which the prosy Western mind needs frequently to be reminded. The literary art of Jesus is well drawn. He is at once "God's Poem and Poet."

A careful reading of this book, and an honest effort to embody the principles so clearly discerned by the author, should assist the preacher from being guilty of what Dean Swift called "the unpardonable sin" of the preacher, namely, dulness.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**A Christian's Life Work. A Christian's Recreation. A Christian's Attitude Toward the Press. Christian World Builders. Christian Young People and World Fellowship. Young People and the Church.** E. L. SHAVER. University of Chicago Press. 1925. Price, 60 cents.

THE typical young people's society in the church weathers rough seas today, if indeed it succeeds in surviving. For many reasons this is the case; among them—seasonable uncertainty of youth faith, open competition of free-time agencies, foreign supervision, inadequately trained leadership, half-baked program materials and methods.

No program, however suggestive, can guarantee life to a society. The above-mentioned manuals, in so far as any program is possible, do stimulate genuine expectancy when presented to intermediate or senior church groups, that is, if there is sufficient enthusiasm burning in the society to ignite hearts for a series of crusades into the meaning and manner of Christian living. They are six stirring projects, each with a quarter-year of concerted activity, and a three-unit weekly system. A group may take its choice of topic, and exercise all the freedom it pleases in developing its resources and discovering its rewards. There are no stereotyped policy, no pre-digested "papers," no foreign and dictated subjects. The whole scheme of activity, whether Sunday or week-day element, is oriented in the world of youth, and it is a challenge to them to find out the character of their inherited culture, and the mutual values of such culture as they can use in the interests of the kingdom of God. Allied Bible materials lend Scriptural support to the studies. Plenty of bibliographical data is affixed.

To illustrate the method, take the text, "The Christian's Life Work." Here is outlined an inclusive program-guide for young people, a program

for one hour Sunday morning, one hour Sunday evening, and a midweek session. On the Sunday evening a Christian doctor, mother, business man, or scientist presents to the society the opportunities his vocation offers for the expression of the Christian life. The following week-day program consists of a social study trip to the speaker's office, plant, or laboratory to study at first hand the nature of the business as it is lived out from day to day. On the next Sunday morning the group congregates to discuss and evaluate the findings of the two previous sessions. A secretary preserves the Christian principles enunciated. Eight or ten such surveys vocational are made, continuing as many weeks, following which the society gathers up the loose threads of social discovery and organizes them into a "Statement of Life Purpose." This may be printed for personal suggestion or made a permanent document of the society. The formal experiment in living inquiringly closes with a life-work banquet during the midweek, and a consecration service on Sunday. The process of social living and aspiring go on; why not more intelligently and more Christian after such a study project?

STEWART G. COLE.

**The Junior. Life-Situations of Children Nine to Eleven Years of Age.** ERNEST J. CHAVE. University of Chicago Press. 1925. Pp. x, 174. Price, $1.25.

AN entirely new method of studying the personal traits of children is springing up. The theistic approach and the introspective and faculty psychologies have served their day. The life-situation technique is in the ascendancy. Since there are no common stock children, but only particular youngsters with private pedigrees, they can be understood and educated as they are interpreted in their behavioristic setting. Religious education, concerned with the *whole* child, must take cognizance of the complete life-situation.

The author of this text in the "Principles and Methods of Religious Education" series of the University of Chicago publications, is one of the first men to investigate the measure of life of junior children from this native point of view. He chose several hundred such youngsters in the Hyde Park district of Chicago and submitted them to rather thorough investigation as to manner of time distribution, physical development, public school, reading, play and game, sight and sound, home, church, and community activities. These functions represent the major gamut of their life investment. A more difficult task it was to attempt to bare the inner urges of these children. The author sought the character of their wishes, holiday desires, ambitions, fears, and hates, by means of a series of carefully wrought out questionnaires which the children themselves

answered. For further check their parents and their teachers in church and school were interviewed. Following a most fascinating presentation of the life-situations of these juniors according to this scheme, Doctor Chave adds a closing chapter on "Some Conclusions for the Religious Educator of the Junior."

The text is "scientific in manner . . . popular in presentation." It is indispensable for all who deal with nine- to eleven-year-old children, whether parent or teacher, provided they are religiously emancipated to think in terms of the whole individual. Child-life is made rich and religious possibilities radiant by such an introduction to the junior. As one reads the manual he is depressed as he notes the wholesale scolding and command methods of training that still prevail, and the consequent injuries done in the little crusaders. On the other hand, there are evidences of a new respect for childhood on the part of many adults. The book will reenforce respect for the child, lend incentive to advanced study of the junior, and give parents and educators a religious perspective whereby they can see children whole.

STEWART G. COLE.

**The Playtime Guide-book.** FREDERICK K. BROWN. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1926. Pp. 165. Price, $1.50.

FOR a denominational publishing board to sponsor a course of study in churches on the subject of play is something relatively new. Yet every one realizes today not only the genuine need of recreations but also the real life-values involved in them. They may be made as sacred as good people please to make them.

In the introduction to the text the author has set as his goal

> to capture the play spirit for God by offering a graded, systematic, and progressive training in the religious significance and practise of play. The course aims to put the child at its earliest teaching age under the influence of play that is religious expression and to keep it there, so far as the church has control, until adult age.

". . . play that is religious expression"; that challenges the smug thinking of us churchmen. But why "until adult age"? Why not throughout adult age?

The manual is set up in two parts. The first, "Graded Recreation," constitutes a treatment of the traits of individuals from the kindergarten age to adult life and a statement of the play principles required to encourage or correct those traits for Christian ends. The second, "The Graded Play-book for the Church School," encompasses a wide range of games and plays descriptively set forth for use by the various age-groups.

The controlling principle of the author is thus expressed: "putting the RIGHT into play life is the opportunity of religious education. . . . We must Christianize recreation." The supposition, as yet pedagogically unfounded, is that "right" exercised in play will necessarily carry over into work activities. More research must be done on the subject of transferred controls before such assumption can be freely used. It would seem the writer has overworked the "victorious losing" law in play. For a child to lose usually, though good-naturedly, would be quite injurious. He would generate self-inferiority difficulties. All virtues when overworked become vices.

There are many features altogether happy in the text. The esthetic as well as the moral values of play are implicitly recognized. That play is one of man's best methods of socialization is also amply illustrated. A good and impartial treatment, as far as it goes, of "the problem of social dancing" in high-school age-groups is offered. The author has gathered up a fund of experience and a gang repertoire and put them at the disposal of church leaders in such form as to become a welcome agent. With little or no preparation, and with relatively amateur leadership, the games can be sponsored to enliven fellowship, and to afford training in many invaluable traits of character.

STEWART G. COLE.

**Finding the Trail of Life.** RUFUS M. JONES. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 148. Price, $1.75.

THIS is the spiritual autobiography of a boy who has since become one of the world's leading authorities on mystical religion. The writer declares it to be his purpose "to interpret the religion of a boy and to show the boy in his struggle to get through the jungle and to find the trail of Life." In a simple and graphic way he has carried out his purpose. With rare insight and literary skill this boy's life in a New England village of half a century ago is portrayed, and the influences which molded his character pointed out. The unique spiritual atmosphere of the Quaker home and meeting, the impressions made by nature and the Scriptures, the inward struggle of the growing boy, the public declaration of desire "to be a Christian," the period of rebellion and doubt following the death of his mother, and the blessing which came through this crisis, are described in a way which cannot help but make lasting impressions for good. It is hard to imagine a more delightful book to place in the hands of our growing youth, or to be thoughtfully read by their parents and teachers.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

**Church Work with Intermediates.** Elizabeth M. Finn. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1926. Pp. 200. Price, $1.25.

One of the most serious problems of modern life, that of religious education for early adolescents, is ably considered in this book. The author brings to her task unusual equipment. This is no "office chair" discussion of the problem, but is based upon practical experience as public-school teacher, church-school worker, and field worker for a great denominational agency for religious education.

As is usual with books intended for use as texts in training courses, this volume is divided into ten chapters. The first of these is devoted to the presentation of the general characteristics of "Those Intermediates." Then follows a careful and comprehensive discussion of the program of instruction and its presentation; of self-expression, play, and worship; of adult leadership and vocational guidance; of the scope of activity and groupings, and of the organization of the Intermediate Department of the church. The book is especially rich in suggestive material as to programs of instruction, play, worship, and organization.

Born of warm-hearted sympathy for the youth of today, marked by a clear-visioned understanding of its characteristics and needs, strengthened by the results of practical experience in the field of religious education, the book makes a notable contribution toward the realization of the imperative with which the writer closes:

> Youth must develop the abilities, attitudes, and ideals that will qualify him to take an intelligent and effective part in the life of the home, the church, the community, the nation, and the world.

Rittenhouse Neisser.

**Psychology and the Church.** Various writers. New York: The Macmillan Company. Pp. 203. Price, $1.50.

Five English college professors undertake to interpret for those interested in the church, especially for clergymen, some of the view-points of modern psychology, and some of the lessons that may be learned in the light of them.

The first essay wisely sets out "The Psychological Standpoint and its Limitations." The impossibility of physical science, and of psychology, to proceed without metaphysical presuppositions, as well as the impossibility of their determining the ultimate nature of Reality, are insisted upon. The idea of God and the idea of an objective world are "projections" of the mind in exactly the same sense. The vital question is, Does the "projection" hit any reality?

The chapter, "The Progress and Present Position of the Study of Psychology," is a rapid sketch of the development of this science from the days of the great Greek creative thinkers to our modern psychotherapists and the behaviorists.

The remaining three lectures take up specific problems where religion and psychology meet, namely, "The Psychology of Prayer and Religious Experience," "The Psychology of Moral Development," and the "Psychology of Spiritual Healing." The range of the treatise is thus limited, but will be found suggestive in matters relating to the several problems covered.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**Anita: A Tale of the Philippines.** P. H. J. LERRIGO, M. D. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1925.

HERE is a story told so naturally that the missionary and his work are vividly pictured; so fascinating as surely to stir interest in the mind of the most indifferent reader. The author, now secretary of a great missionary society, bases the story on the actual experiences of himself and his colleagues while missionaries in the Philippines.

The book portrays the various phases of the work of the missionary—evangelistic, educational, medical—and recounts some of their sufferings, sacrifices, and successes; it reveals their numerous activities and varied opportunities. It is a story full of pathos, yet relieved by bright touches of humor. The incidents circle about Anita, a little blind beggar girl whose sight is restored and whose life is transformed through contact with the missionaries.

The book might well be used by the teacher in story-telling, for after all it is a series of missionary experiences, woven together into a whole.

GRACE E. NEISSER.

**The Great Partnership.** REV. JOHN ARCHIBALD MACCALLUM, D. D. New York: George H. Doran Company. Pp. 320. Price, $2.00.

IT was said of Doctor Emmons, the learned New England divine, that his sermons when collected were "a veritable body of divinity." These chapters in Doctor MacCallum's book were probably not preached just as they are printed, but are from the thinking of an active minister, for fifteen years pastor of the Walnut Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. The great partnership is of course that between God and man, and the treatment falls into three parts—God expressed in action, in attribute, and in essence. This is doubtless the best order of treatment,

since we proceed in our knowledge of God from the outward to the inward. Doctor MacCallum has the modern approach, beginning with experience; and he does not stop till he discloses the social implicits in the divine-human partnership.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**Crowds of Souls.** CLINTON WUNDER. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 183.

HERE is a manual of methods, growing out of the somewhat brief, yet very successful experience of a young minister who deliberately went after the crowds and got them. Underlying the program of Clinton Wunder, pastor of the Baptist Temple, Rochester, is the theory that the successful management of a modern church is not essentially different from the successful management of a modern business house; that competition must be met by promotion, publicity, advertising, putting business into religion. Many valuable suggestions are found for making church methods and church programs more vital. Yet, when all is said, *personality* is a large factor in such matters. "Why do you not preach like Dwight L. Moody?" said a small business man to his pastor, "Why do you not do business like John Wanamaker?" was the pastor's pertinent reply. All pastors cannot do business like Wunder, for all are not wonders. But all would probably be benefited by a sympathetic reading of Wunder's book.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**The Singers of Judah's Hills.** CHARLES ARTHUR BOYD. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 157.

THE author is pastor of the First Baptist Church of Marquette, Michigan. With cultured imagination he undertakes a "Series of Song Settings for Selected Psalms." The author, therefore, disclaims that his book is a commentary on the Psalms, but "simply a series of loosely related story settings for eighteen of the Psalms." These eighteen are among the best known and most beloved of those spiritual poems which have inspired the religious imagination and kindled the devotions of thousands through the centuries.

The general flavor of the book may be at least hinted at by some of the titles. Psalm 1 becomes "The Song of the Planted Tree," Psalm 8, "The Song of the Midnight Beauty," Psalm 19, "The Song of Sunrise Glory," Psalm 23, "The Song of the Shepherds' Day," Psalm 29, "The Song of the Thunderstorm," etc.

The little volume will aid the devotional reader of these Psalms to a livelier appreciation of their meaning and beauty, and the preacher to reconstruct the background for a series of sermons upon them.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**Five Minutes Daily with Luther.** JOHN T. MULLER. New York: The Macmillan Company. Pp. 375. Price, $2.50.

THE professor of Systematic Theology in Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, has selected from the writings of the great German reformer three hundred and sixty-five pieces of exposition, or meditation, one for each day in the year. The shape of the volume and the binding make this collection a serviceable *vade-mecum*. An appropriate verse of poetry is placed at the end of every selection. The poetry is not Luther's. Those who are looking for a book for daily meditation and aid in personal devotions, may find in this volume what they want. It is a little heavy for use in family worship. The selections are so made as to present a very good cross-section of Luther's religious teachings. His favorite *Galatians* is well represented.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**Pillars of Gold.** MITCHELL BRONK. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. Pp. 211. Price, $1.50 net.

A VERY delightful series of essays by a master of clear, simple, beautiful English prose style. There are nineteen of these charming talks, on subjects as far apart as "At the Home of St. Francis" and "My Pilgrim Father," as "Sunshine Through the Berry Brambles" and "Graveyards as a Hobby."

The volume is a beautiful piece of book-making and will prove care-beguiling at the close of day to one who likes to follow a well-traveled friend into some of the attractive by-paths of his experience and thinking. It will make a fitting gift-book.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**British Preachers.** Edited by SIR JAMES MARCHANT. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1926. Pp. 338. Price, $1.75.

THIS is the second series, collected by the same editor from the sermons of prominent living British preachers. Most of these are already well known in America. Such are G. A. Studdert Kennedy, H. R. Mackintosh, J. Estlin Carpenter, A. E. Garvie, J. Scott Lidgett, W. E. Orchard, J. D. Jones, and others—twenty-four in all.

Nearly all of these sermons are upon vital themes, chiefly from the New Testament. There are exceptions: for example, Rev. Philip Napier Waggett in the most tortuous and unconvincing fashion defends the Eucharist as a sacrifice. Only twice do rather strange and unusual texts appear. Rev. Dinsdale T. Young, Wesleyan, discourses on "A Casual Question and Its Modern Implications," from the text "Dost thou know Greek?" (Acts 21 : 37). Rev. John D. Jones allegorizes the text "And he closed the book" (Luke 14 : 20). The collection on the whole, is a valuable one, and doubtless a fair sample of British preaching today.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**Evolution and the Christian Faith.** H. H. LANE, Professor of Zoology, University of Kansas. Princeton University Press. Pp. 214. Price, $2.00.

**The Bankruptcy of Evolution.** HAROLD C. MORTON. London and New York: Marshall Brothers, Limited. 1925. Pp. 196.

THESE volumes are not true yoke-fellows, for they pull in opposite directions, even though both authors are zealous for the Christian faith, as each sees it.

Professor Lane first gives a sketch of the historic struggle between science and theology—not between science and religion, mind you. Perhaps it were better still to have written between "scientists and theologians." The first main part of the treatment is taken up with evidences for "the fact of evolution," and then, particularly, the evidences generally cited to confirm the claim that man too is a part of the evolutionary scheme. The second part takes up the philosophical and the religious aspects of the question. The author finds no difficulty in adjusting his scientific theories with his Christian faith and holds to the spiritual values of the Scriptures even when scientific conflicts are plain. It would probably be too much to expect of Professor Lane that he advance any new argument either for evolution, or for the position that no discovery in the realm of the physical world can overthrow, or discredit, the facts of Christian experience. But the book is clearly written and therefore easily readable.

It has been generally supposed that the recent flare-up concerning evolution is distinctly "made in America." But here we have an animated little volume by an Englishman, on "The Bankruptcy of Evolution." He begins with the words, "There is very great confusion in the mind of the British public as to the whole subject of the bearings and truth of the Theory of Evolution." So we see that there are others

besides Tennesseeans who are "confused." Though the volume is not so strong a document against evolution as others that have been written, notably that by Professor O'Toole, "The Case Against Evolution," yet Doctor Morton's book presents the case with clarity and force. The chief weakness in the discussion is that the brunt of the attack is against Darwinian Evolution. In large portions of the book therefore the author is storming a citadel which has been evacuated by many, if not most, scientists who hold to the evolutionary theory. In reading either or both of these books one will be impressed with the thought that there are many claims of scientists that hang upon very slender evidence, that we must yet wait for light upon many matters; and also that it is far easier to find defects in an opponent's theory than to furnish an hypothesis against which fewer objections may be lodged.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**An Outline of the History of Christian Literature.** GEORGE LEOPOLD HURST, B. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 547.

WHY did no one think of such a book as this before? is one's first thought when it comes to hand; and, I wonder how well the author has done his work? is the second. To the first query there seems to be no answer save the old one, Because. To the second, after due examination, one replies, Very well, indeed. For a "road-breaking" book, as the Germans say, it is gratifyingly full and accurate. The author exhibits adequate scholarship and industry, and such insight into the heart of matters discussed as makes his necessarily brief summaries of the contents of books, great and small, illuminating and serviceable. As a convenient handbook and guide to the Christian literature of all ages, it will be as useful to the pastor and lay reader as to the professional scholar, though in a different way.

In attempting to cover so vast a field in so brief space, some defects were inevitable. The following are to be regarded rather as hints that will enable the author to better his work in a later edition, than as serious complaints against what he has now done. There is an occasional error in the form of proper names, as "Arout" for "Arouet" for Voltaire (p. 438). The account of Molinos is correct, so far as it goes, but will inevitably convey an entirely false impression of his relations to the Inquisition, if a reader has no further information than the author gives (p. 402). The same is true of the statements regarding Fénélon and Bossuet (p. 409). It strikes one as a rather curious omission, that while much space is assigned to William Law and his writings, as well as to John Wesley, no hint is given as to the great influence of Law over the early life and thinking of Wesley (pp. 473 sq., 478). Another curious

omission is that, while quite sufficient space is given to the writings of Adolphe Monod, no mention is made of Theodore Monod, probably much the better known of the two to English and American readers.

It would be easy, and perhaps unprofitable, to increase the number of such instances. The author will himself detect more probably than any reader. One sincerely hopes that the reception of the work will be so favorable that the author will be encouraged to make still better that which is already so good.

HENRY C. VEDDER.